Some Aspects of The Earliest Social History of India

5728

(PRE-BUDDHISTIC AGES)

S.C. SARKĀR

SR
Amar

5828

SOME ASPECTS OF THE EARLIEST SOCIAL HISTORY OF INDIA

(Pre-Buddhistic Ages)

Some Aspects of the Earliest Social History of India

(Pre-Buddhistic Ages)

By

Dr. S.C. SARKAR, A.M. Dphil. (Oxon.)

A brief biographical account of Dr. S.C. Sarkar,
Bibliography and Index prepared by

Dr. RAJENDRA RAM

1985

JANAKI PRAKASHAN
PATNA NEW DELHI

First Published, 1928
First Indian Edition (Enlarged) 1985

© Copyright Reserved

Price, Rs. 150/-

Published by :
Nand Kishore Singh
Janaki Prakashan
Ashok Rajpath,
Chauhatta,
Patna-800 004.

Branch Office :
A-1/139 B Keshav Puram
Madhav Marg
Delhi-110 035.

संग्रहालय ... लखनऊ
क्रम 5828
प्राप्ति
State Museum, Library, Lko.

Printed by :
Taj Offset Press,
Delhi &
Shabdankan,
Maujpur,
Delhi-110 053

DR. SUBIMAL CHANDRA SARKAR
29 August, 1889—9 October, 1954
(Courtesy : Dr. Yogendra Mishra)

Dr. Subimal Chandra Sarkar : Life and Work

(*19 August 1889—9 October 1954*)

Family History

The ancestors of S.C. Sarkar migrated from Karnataka to Bengal about 16th century A.D. First of all they settled at Harihal in the Hooghly district of West Bengal. From there they shifted to Sorisha, a village situated about four miles north of the Diamond Harbour in the Chaubis Pargana District of West Bengal. Their original family name was Deb. It changed to Sarkar, evidently in the Muslim period as a mark of official employment. In course of the movement from one place to the other, the family of Sarkars came into the contact with the ancestors of the famous Pandit Sibnath Sastri, the great Brahmo leader. Consequently the members of the family of S.C. Sarkar became the followers of the Brahmo Samaj.

According to the genealogy record of the early members the family of S.C. Sarkar have come to light. They were Yadabendra Chandra Sarkar, Dataram, Ajodhyaram, Hara Kumar and Thakurdas. Thakurdas had three sons, Charuchandra Sarkar, Suresh Chandra Sarkar and Jatish Chandra Sarkar. Suresh Chandra Sarkar had four issues, two sons and two daughters born of two wives. The first wife of Suresh Chandra Sarkar was Srimati Bimala Sarkar. She was blessed with only one issue, a male child, whose name was Subimal Chandra Sarkar.

The second wife of Suresh Chandra Sarkar was Srimati Sarojini Ray. She was blessed with three issues, a daughter, Asha Sarkar, a son, Sushobhan Chandra Sarkar and another daughter, Shobha Sarkar.

Suresh Chandra Sarkar was a member of the Civil Service under the Government of Bengal. His first wife Smt. Bimala Sarkar, the mother of Subimal Chandra Sarkar, was the second daughter of Girish Chandra Majumdar, who was the Brahmo preacher and the leader of the Barisal fame. Smt. Manorma Majumdar, the maternal grand mother of S.C. Sarkar was the first Brahmo lady to preach from a pulpit. The elder sister of Smt. Bimala Sarkar was Smt. Nirmala Sarkar, who was the wife of the great physician of Calcutta, Sir Nilratan Sarkar in whose memory "Nilratan Sarkar Medical College" was established which was formerly known as the Campbell Medical Institute. Thus the family of Subimal Chandra Sarkar was connected with the intellectual luminaries belonging to the faculties of humanities and science. Above all, he had got an authentic historical pedigree from his father's side.

Early Life

Subimal Chandra Sarkar got his school education at Chittagong (in present Bangladesh), and at Contai (Midnapur District of West Bengal), where his father, Suresh Chandra Sarkar had been posted as the member of the Bengal Civil Service. He studied during his college days in the City College, Calcutta under the principalship of Heramba Chandra Maitra. He got his M.A. degree in Ancient Indian History and Culture from Calcutta University in 1911.

In course of his academic career, prior to employment, Subimal Chandra Sarkar spent many years with his father, who was serving under the Bengal Civil Service. Later he spent many of his holidays with his father, who was then posted at many places in Bihar, which formed the part of Bengal till 1912. He developed a special aptitude for the study of Bihar and its past history.

An Antiquarian House

The father of Subimal Chandra Sarkar had built an excellent home at Bariganda (Muhalla) in Giridih (Hazaribagh district at that time) and left his ancestral home at Sorisha, in Chaubis Pargana. He never returned to his ancestral home of Sorisha. Father and son were emotionally attached to the place and sight of their Bariganda home. They gave it a name UPALAPATH (Gravel Downs). The gate of the house was designed after the model of Sanchi Gate. The front columns of the house were designed after the fluted conic columns. Finally a Kashmiri wood-screen with folds and silver filigree work for partitioning a huge hall of the house was adjusted. This house was built with joint artistic taste of the father and son. It commanded their utmost care and love. Earlier father and son very often studied ancient Indian History together. This affection was given a shape in artistic architectural design of their sweet home of Bariganda at Giridih.

First Employment at Dacca (1911-1917)

Subimal Chandra Sarkar began his career as a lecturer in Ancient Indian History and Culture at the Jagannath College, Dacca (present capital of Bangladesh), when Rai Lalitmohan Chatterji Bahadur, an eminent scholar of English, was its Principal. His reputation as the successful and learned teacher was known to all. He took keen interest in cultural activity of the college.

During one summer vacation S.C. Sarkar was staying with his father at Ranchi where he roamed in search of an object in the lap of nature. One day he drew a large scale pencil sketch of a maiden drawing water from a spring to full a pitcher and headed it with a meaningful line:

"Hears and hears, and lets it overflow".

During the same period of his stay at Ranchi, S.C. Sarkar, after a shower of rain, pointed to his younger brother (Sushobhan Chandra Sarkar) a meadow of shimmering grass in front of a house and quoted a part of the line of Tennyson:

"And the waves of shadow went over the wheat".

S.C. Sarkar rendered into English a famous Bengali poem by Sarala Devi for *The Jagannath College Magazine*:

"O beautious Spring, Once more do bring.
The golden past back again".

He was fond of rainy season to which he composed an ode entitled, "An Ode to the Rains".

"Like Caesar triumph is August,
come ————"

During his stay at Dacca, S.C. Sarkar learned to play on 'Surbahar' (a classical musical instrument) under the guidance of the veteran 'Sitarist', Sri Indranath. He practised regularly under his Guru and finally reached his desired goal in this field. His Guru, Sri Indranath was so much impressed with S.C. Sarkar that he gifted his own instrument to his disciple, who cherished it ever afterwards.

Employment at Patna (1917-1920)

Subimal Chandra Sarkar joined the Bihar Educational Service as a Professor of History in the New College at Patna (at present known as Patna College), on 1 May 1917. He delved deep into his subject of ancient Indian History and acquainted his students with valuable facts, events and the unique pieces of historical interpretation. His surviving pupils pay glowing tribute to him for his methods of teaching and research. He used to speak English like his mother tongue.

Professor Sarkar became a permanent Professor of History on 12 July 1919. A year later he was appointed as the Principal of the New College on 12 July 1920. His service was put in the cadre of Bihar & Orissa Educational Service on 8 August 1920. His role as a successful teacher, an eminent historian and as an efficient educational administrator as the Principal of New College became a legend of the time.

Higher Studies at Oxford University(1920-1923)

In recognition of his service to the cause of teaching and research Professor Sarkar was granted a study leave (16 August 1920 to 18 January 1923) by the Government of Bihar for doing D. Phil. from Oxford University. Professor Sarkar went to England where he carried on research on the subject entitled *Some Aspects of the Earliest Social History of India* (*Pre-Buddhistic Ages*) under the supervision of F.E. Pargiter at Oxford University. Professor Sarkar got the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the Oxford University in 1923. The thesis was published in 1928 by the Oxford University Press, London. In its preface Dr. Sarkar writes that Mr. Pargiter's *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* (Oxford University Press, 1922), which seeks to determine the political history of India from the earliest times to the seventh century B.C., and *Some Aspects of the Earliest Social History of India* (*Pre-Buddhistic Ages*), which attempts an accurate picture of some aspects of the social history of India for the same period, may be regarded as companion volumes, which have to be read together for a fuller understanding of Vedic History than has hitherto been possible. Further, Dr. Sarkar has pointed out that many of his inferences and suggestions (of 1920-1922) had been amply justified by subsequent archaeological excavations in different parts of India.[1] In a 'Foreword' to this book F.E. Pargiter writes that "one inference that such independent research appears to elicit is that the Aryans, when they entered India, found in places a degree of civilisation as high as their own, if not higher, especially in Oudh and North Bihar; and there need be nothing surprising in that, because it has happened more than once in the history of the world that a more virile tribe has overcome and entered into a higher civilisation, and has afterwards carried that on to further excellence."[2] In 'An Introductory And Critical Note' to the book of Dr. Sarkar Maurice Winternitz mentions that "Now I read it with delighted interest, though in many details I could not agree with the author, and I read it even more than once, in order to re-examine his arguments, where I differed from him. But from the very beginning I highly appreciated the scholarly instinct with which he has extracted from the Vedic texts every little detail that had even the least bearing on Social life."[3] Further he states that "the most interesting chapters . . . are doubtless those on Sex-relations and the status of Women in Ancient India". Finally Winternitz mentions, "I am myself rather sceptical about some of these suggestions; yet I cannot help admiring the absolutely unprejudiced and truly historical spirit in which the whole investigation is carried on by the author. And therefore I have great pleasure in recommending the book to all scholars who are interested in the history of Ancient India"[5]

---

[1] S.C. Sarkar, *Some Aspects of the Earliest Social History of India* (*Pre-Buddhistic Ages*), London : Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1928, p. iii.

Dr. S.C Sarkar, during his stay at Oxford University also acquired Diploma in Education.

Dr. S.C. Sarkar at Patna University (1923-1944)

Dr. S.C. Sarkar returned to India on 19 January, 1923 and resumed his duties as Professor of History at Patna College. He was put in the cadres of the Bihar and Orissa Educational Service. He became Vice-Principal of Training College, Patna, on 23 July 1923. Three years later he was made an officiating Principal of Training College, Cuttack, which he joined on 12 July 1926.

Dr. S.C. Sarkar came back to Patna College and resumed his duties as Professor and Head of the Department of History

---

2. F.E. Pargiter, *Ibid.*, p.v.
3. Maurice Winternitz, *Ibid* , p. vii.
4. *Ibid.*, p. viii.
5. *Ibid.*, p. xi.

on 15 July 1927.[6] He was well-versed in Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit languages, which are the original sources for ancient Indian History. He had an eas access to ancient Indian inscriptions. In recognition of his extraordinary scholarship in ancient Indian History and Culture Dr. Sarkar, at the invitation of Patna University, delivered Readership Lectures for the 1925-1926 which were published as an independent work entitled, *Educational Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India* (*cir. 15th to the 10th century B.C.*) as indicated in the Atharvavedic and the *Rāmāyaṇic Tradition*, being the 1925-26 Readership Lectures, Patna University, 1928. Later, Dr. S.C. Sarkar was promoted and confirmed simultaneously to Class I of Bihar & Orissa Educational Service with effect from 1 April 1930.

Dr. Sarkar was living in the Ranighat teachers' first quarters situated on the right hand side (south) of the road, which passes from Law College towards east. His old and retired father was also living with him. It was at this residence that his farther Suresh Chandra Sarkar died in 1931, which was a shock to Dr. Sarkar. Dr. Sarkar later became the warden of the hostels of Patna College and shifted to the Warden's House in the campus of Patna College.

As Warden of Patna College hostels Dr. Sarkar came close to the students. Here all the students of history were very keen in observing the life and activity of Dr. Sarkar. His memories preserved in the head and heart of his surviving students are in legion. It is said that in course of his lectures in the Intermediate classes Dr. Sarkar always used to present facts under the perspective of the global history. While teaching the history of Aśoka he used to enumerate eminent contemporary rulers of Aśoka reigning in different parts of the world. He was anxious to acquaint his students with important facts and valuable events of history published in the learned journals which were not accessible even to learned professors, not to

---

6. Former Head of the Department of History, Sir Jadunath Sarkar retired tn 1926 and became the Vice-Chancellor of Calcutta University.

speak of inquisitive students. Thus he kept his students up-to-date.

Dr. S.C. Sarkar frequently cited original taxts in course of his class lectures in B.A. classes. He used to exhibit the heavy and bulky text of the *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, edited by E. Hultzsch and showed it to the students for eradicating the fear of bulky size and toughness of the books from the mind of the students. He treated his students as serious seekers of knowledge. He was always anxious to discover points of originality in the mind of his students. With this view in his mind Dr. S.C. Sarkar took keen interest in raising some issues so that his students might be enabled to think over them and respond in their own ways.

Keeping the interests of the students in view Dr. S.C. Sarkar proposed a scheme for writing a college text-book of Modern Indian History and executed it with the collaboration of a junior but research-minded lecturer, named, K.K. Datta, who, later, emerged as a scholar of modern Indian history of an international repute. In the 'Preface' to this book (Vol. II, part I), Dr. Sarkar states, "from the standpoint of the educator present-day college text-books of Indian history are not very helpful, even when they are written by scholars of repute. Amongst their defects that can be remedied without much difficulty are : (i) inadequate 'documentation' or reference to original sources or other authorities for statements made, (ii) persistence in the same old plan of 'formal' chronological presentation of matter, e.g., reign by reign, (iii) neglect of critical historical judgement, and repetition of discarded theories and notions of or the 'heresies of history'. . . . Apart from drawing attention to the sources of each important statement in the book, arranging the facts topically wherever suitable, and introducing fresh perspectives, suggestive criticisms and judgement of evidence, the usefulness of the book has been sought to be improved by a bibliography both for junior and advanced students, by illustrative maps selected on a somewhat fresh plan, and by comparative time-chart". Thus Dr. S.C. Sarkar presented the unique and an exacting standard for utilizing research oriented text-book for college students, first of all in our country.

In one of his seminar lectures, organised by the Department of History, Patna University in 1979, Dr. B.P. Sinha[7] said, "I have visited the universities of the United Kingdom at one of which I obtained my Ph. D. degree, of Europe and of America; I have listened to the learned lectures of several senior professors and erudite scholars of these universities, such as the Late Dr. L.D. Barnett, Dr. Norman Brown and at present Dr. A.L. Basham. But nowhere have I found the thought-provoking, freshness, clarity, originality and depth of learning that could esaily be discovered in Dr. S.C. Sarkar here". Dr. Yogendra Mishra[8] remarked that Dr. S.C. Sarkar was a teacher full of confidence about his knowledge of history of the world and of ancient India. He had direct and easy approach to the original sources. Points of his class lectures noted by students could never be discovered at one place in one book. His utterances, ways of pronunciation and tones of speech bore the imprint of his magnanimous personality. Of all teachers of history at Patna University, Dr. Mishra was very close to Dr. S.C. Sarkar. It was because of this closeness that Dr. Mishra wrote a book on Aśoka (in Hindi) and dedicated to his memory in 1965.[9]

Dr. S.C. Sarkar was influenced by the activity of the Brahmo Samaj. It is evident from his treatment of the subjects of ancient Indian History and Culture discussed and interpreted in his books cited above. He presented scientific and material interpretations of ancient Indian history and culture. He did not lag behind the Marxist historians of

---

[7] Retired Professor and Head, Dept. of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Patna University.

[8] Retired Professor and Head, Department of History, Patna University.

[9] When a copy of this book was presented to Dr. Sushobhan Chandra Sarkar at Patna, overwhelmed with feelings he remarked, "I am glad to see that even now there are people at Patna, who remember my brother."

India at a time when reading, writing or researching of ancient Indian History on Marxist line was a far-fetched aspiration. I am strongly of the view that Dr. S.C. Sarkar's association with the Brahmos under whose contacts he read and interpred ancient Indian history on material and scientific lines, gave a sound lease to his historiography of ancient Indian culture and civilisation.

During the last few years of teaching at Patna University Dr. S.C. Sarkar became seriously interested in the Tibetan sources of ancient Indian history. He used to visit Darjeeling, Kalimpong and Sikkim during the Summer and the Durga Puja vacations. A bibliography of his works mentioned below may throw light on his zest for the learning of ancient Indian history from Tibetan angle and with Tibetan eyes.[10]

Dr. S.C. Sarkar retired in the year 1944 and settled at his Boring Road residence of west Patna. He was member of many learned institutions and academic bodies. He was elected as the General Secretary of Bihar Research Society on 3 February 1946 and remained there up to 2 January 1950. He was also the member of the Managing Committee of the Patna Museum from 3 July 1944 to 3 July 1950. He enjoyed these honours after his retirement from the Bihar Educational Service and had enjoyed special grade in Indian Educational Service getting Rs. 1250/- per month (few persons used to enjoy this financial distinction). While retiring in 1944, Dr. Sarkar observed on the time of farewell given to him, "One never retires in life having a strong desire to excel." He presided over the local History Section of the Indian History Congress held at Patna in the last week of December 1946. His Presidential Address began with a remark: "History like many other good things begins at home". He was honoured by the Vaiśālī Sangha as the President of Fifth Vaiśālī Festival (11 April 1949) at Vaiśālī. During his stay at Boring Road residence after retirement he was found pro-foundly engaged translating the famous Sanskrit work of ancient Indian dramatist Bharata. Incidentally the dear family house "The Upalapatha" at Bariganda, Giridih, had to be sold in 1947 at the insistence of his elder son, who wanted the money badly for his stay in England. Dr. Subimal Chandra Sarkar breathed his last on 9 October 1954 at his Boring Road residence of West Patna.

---

[10] Unfortunately the bibliography prepared by us of his research papers including those based on Tibetan sources is not exhaustive.

In preparing this brief biographical sketch of Dr. Subimal Chandra Sarkar I got immense help from the late Dr. Sushobhan Chandra Sarkar, his son, Professor Sumit Sarkar (Delhi University), daughter, Dr. Shipra Sarkar (Jadavpur University). I am grateful to Dr. Yogendra Mishra (Retired Professor and Head of the Department of History of Patna University), who is so full of reminiscences about Dr. S.C. Sarkar for the period 1937 to 1954. I have also derived help from Sri Tara Sharan Sinha, Director, State Archive, Government of Bihar, Patna, and from Sri Maheshwari Sahay, retired Head Asstt., Patna Museum, who helped me in their own ways. I am thankful to Sri Nand Kishore Singh of Janaki Prakashan for undertaking this work of reprint of this much needed book.

Dr. Rajendra Ram,
Lecturer in History
Patna University.

profoundly engaged in translating the famous Sanskrit work of ancient Indian medicine [illegible]. Incidentally the then family house "[illegible]" at [illegible], [illegible], was sold in 1940 at the insistence of his elder son, who needed the money badly for his stay in England. Dr. Subodh Chandra Sarkar breathed his last on [illegible] October 1954 at his Boring Road residence of West Patna.

In preparing this brief biographical sketch of Dr. Subodh Chandra Sarkar I got immense help from the late Dr. Subodh Chandra Sarkar, his son, Professor [illegible] Sarkar ([illegible]) and his daughter, Dr. [illegible] Sarkar ([illegible] University). I am grateful to Dr. Yogendra Mishra, Retired Professor and Head of the Department of History of Patna University who [illegible] full of reminiscences about Dr. S.C. Sarkar for the period 1937 to 1954. I have also received help from Sri Ram [illegible] Singh, Director, State Archives, Government of Bihar, Patna, and from Sri Mahesh [illegible] Sarkar, retired Head Asstt., Patna Museum, who helped me in their own ways. I am thankful to Sri Nand Kishore Singh of [illegible] Prakashan for undertaking the work of reprint of this needed book.

Dr. [illegible]
Lecturer in History
Patna University

Bibliography of the Writings of Dr. S.C. Sarkar

Books

1. *Some Aspects of the Earliest Social History of India* (Pre-Buddhistic Ages), Oxford University Press, London, 1928.

2. *Educational Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India* (*Cir.* 15th to the 10th century B.C.) as Indicated in I the *Atharvavedic Texts* and II the *Ramayanic* Tradition, being the 1925-26 Readership Lectures, Patna University, 1928. Reprint, by Janaki Prakashan, Patna, 1979.

3. *Text-Book of Modern Indian History* (under collaboration with K.K. Datta) (from 1526 to the Present Day) Vol. I (in three parts); Vol. II, Part I, 1933 (Ist ed.), 1938 Vol. II, part II, 1934 (Ist ed.), 1938 (2nd Ed.) The Indian Press Ltd., Allahabad.

Edited Work

1. *Vaiśālī* (A collection of articles and other pieces on Vaiśālī), edited jointly with Dr. Yogendra Mishra, Muzaffarpur, 1945.

Articles

1. 'Tibetan Titbits', *J BORS*, Vol. XXVI, No. III, 1941: I- "Tilopa and Noropa", pp. 224-235.

2. A Tibetan Account of Bengal', *J BORS*, Vol. XXVI, No. IV, 1941: "Miscellaneous Articles: A Tibetan Account of Bengal" pp. 341-370.

3. 'A Tibetan Account of Bengal', *J BORS*, Vol. XXVII, No. II, 1942: "A Tibetan Account of Bengal", Part II (B), About Chandragupta, Chanakya, Vindusara and Sri Chandra", pp. 221-254.

4. "Notes on a Tibetan Account of Bengal', *J Bors*, Vol. XXVII, No. III, 1942: pp. 384-397.

5. "Some Tibetan References to the Muslim Advance in Bihar and Bengal and the State of Buddhism Thereafter", *PIHRC*, Vol. 18, 1942, pp. 138-152.

6. Notes on a Tibetan Account of Bengal (The Five Extracts)', *J BORS*. Vol. XXVII, No. IV, 1942: "Appendix", pp. 554-569.

7. 'Research Notes and Queries', *JBRS*, Vol. XXX, Nos. III-IV, 1945: "Problems raised by Tibetan Roots", pp. 159-163.

8. "Ancient Indian Principles of Occupation of Conquered Territory (Based Primarily on Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*). *JBRS*, Vol. HXXV, No. III, 1946, pp. 148-154.

9. "India's Cultural Contacts", *JBRS*, Vol. XXXII, No. I, 1947, pp. 7-8.

10. 'Bharata's Nāṭya-Śāstra', Chapter II, Maṇḍapavidhāna, *JBRS*, Vol. XXXII. No. II, 1947: "Contribution of Theatre-Hall" in Treatise or the Dramatic Art of Sri Bharata", pp. 113-134.

11. "Research Notes and Queries', *JBRS*, Vol. XXXII, Nos. III-IV 1947: "The Pāṇḍavas", pp. 328-330.

12. Review of: "Folk-Songs of Chattisgarh" by Verrier Elwni, *JBRS*, Vol. XXXII, Nos. III-IV, 1947, pp. 334-339.

13. "The Bihar Research Society and Its Work" (The first of the series of public lectures planned by the Society, delivered on 16 March 1947 under the Chairmanship of Sacchidananda Sinha), *JBRS*, Vol. XXXIII, Nos. I-II, 1948, pp. 104-113.

14. "Catalogue of the Miscellaneous Tibetan Xylography Works in the Bihar Research Society's Library, Patna", *JBRS*, Vol. XXXIII, Nos. III-IV, 1948, pp. 155-158.

15. "The Pre-Buddhistic Ancient Historical Traditions of the Vaiśālī Region", *Homage to Vaiśālī*, Edited by J.C. Mathur and Yogendra Mishra, Vaiśālī Samgha, Vaisali (Bihar), 1948 pp. 45-66.

16. "The Heritage of Vaiśālī and A Reconstruction programme for the Vaiśālī Sangha", pp. 1-10 (being the Presidential address at the Fifth Vaiśālī Festival (11 April 1949) at Vaiśālī), The Vaiśālī Sangha, Vaiśālī (Bihar) 1949. This Address has been included in the revised and enlarged edition of *Homage to Vaiśālī*, Vaiśālī Prakrit Institute, Vaiśālī, pp. 51-59.

2. A Tibetan Account of Bengal', *J BORS*, Vol. XXVI, No. IV, 1941: "Miscellaneous Articles: A Tibetan Account of Bengal" pp. 341-370.

3. 'A Tibetan Account of Bengal', *J BORS*, Vol. XXVII, No. II, 1942: "A Tibetan Account of Bengal", Part II (B), About Chandragupta, Chanakya, Vindusara and Sri Chandra", pp. 221-254.

4. "Notes on a Tibetan Account of Bengal', *J Bors*, Vol. XXVII, No. III, 1942: pp. 384-397.

5. "Some Tibetan References to the Muslim Advance in Bihar and Bengal and the State of Buddhism Thereafter", *PIHRC*, Vol. 18, 1942, pp. 138-152.

6. Notes on a Tibetan Account of Bengal (The Five Extracts)', *J BORS*. Vol. XXVII, No. IV, 1942: "Appendix", pp. 554-569.

7. 'Research Notes and Queries', *JBRS*, Vol. XXX, Nos. III-IV, 1945: "Problems raised by Tibetan Roots", pp. 159-163.

8. "Ancient Indian Principles of Occupation of Conquered Territory (Based Primarily on Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*). *JBRS*, Vol. HXXV, No. III, 1946, pp. 148-154.

9. "India's Cultural Contacts", *JBRS*, Vol. XXXII, No. I, 1947, pp. 7-8.

10. 'Bharata's Nāṭya-Śāstra', Chapter II, Maṇḍapavidhāna, *JBRS*, Vol. XXXII. No. II, 1947: "Contribution of Theatre-Hall" in Treatise or the Dramatic Art of Sri Bharata", pp. 113-134.

11. "Research Notes and Queries', *JBRS*, Vol. XXXII, Nos. III-IV 1947: "The Pāṇḍavas", pp. 328-330.

12. Review of: "Folk-Songs of Chattisgarh" by Verrier Elwni, *JBRS*, Vol. XXXII, Nos. III-IV, 1947, pp. 334-339.

13. "The Bihar Research Society and Its Work" (The first of the series of public lectures planned by the Society, delivered on 16 March 1947 under the Chairmanship of Sacchidananda Sinha), *JBRS*, Vol. XXXIII, Nos. I-II, 1948, pp. 104-113.

14. "Catalogue of the Miscellaneous Tibetan Xylography Works in the Bihar Research Society's Library, Patna", *JBRS*, Vol. XXXIII, Nos. III-IV, 1948, pp. 155-158.

15. "The Pre-Buddhistic Ancient Historical Traditions of the Vaiśālī Region", *Homage to Vaiśālī*, Edited by J.C. Mathur and Yogendra Mishra, Vaiśālī Samgha, Vaisali (Bihar), 1948 pp. 45-66.

16. "The Heritage of Vaiśālī and A Reconstruction programme for the Vaiśālī Sangha", pp. 1-10 (being the Presidential address at the Fifth Vaiśālī Festival (11 April 1949) at Vaiśālī), The Vaiśālī Sangha, Vaiśālī (Bihar) 1949. This Address has been included in the revised and enlarged edition of *Homage to Vaiśālī*, Vaiśālī Prakrit Institute, Vaiśālī, pp. 51-59.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THE publication of this dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the Oxford University has been delayed for more than five years, owing partially to pressure of my official duties and press troubles, but much more to lack of funds.

I take this opportunity of gratefully remembering the late Mr. Pargiter for the invaluable training in research work that I have had under his supervision at Oxford, and thanking Professors Macdonell, Barnett and Winternitz, Dr Morison and Sir G. A. Grierson, for much valuable advice and criticism from time to time; and also of expressing my appreciation of the consideration shown by the Convocation of the Oxford University in permitting me to take my degree in person, before the dissertation could be placed with a press and publisher.

No pains have been spared to verify the references and make them full and accurate; but in a work like this some errors and misprints are almost inevitable; and I shall be grateful to scholars for pointing out any mistakes of reference, etc., that may strike them during perusal.

Mr. Pargiter's Ancient Indian Historical Tradition (Oxford University Press, 1922), which seeks to determine the political history of India from the earliest times to the 7th century B.C, and the present work (nearing completion in MS. while the former was in the Press), which attempts an accurate picture of some aspects of the social history of India for the same period, may be regarded as companion volumes, which have to be read together for a fuller understanding of Vedic History than has hitherto been possible.

I need hardly add what must strike every reader that many of my inferences and suggestions (of 1920—'22) have been amply justified by subsequent archæological excavations in different parts of India, and the time is not distant when it will be acknowledged that Vedic and pre-Āryan civilization originated in the Lower Gangetic regions and travelled westwards.

S. C. SARKĀR.

PATNA, INDIA: *March, 1928.*

FOREWORD

[F. E. Pargiter]

This book is the Thesis on " Some Aspects of the Earliest Social History of India," by which Dr. Subimal Chandra Sarkār gained the degree of D. Phil. here. It is the outcome of extensive research, not only in the Vedic and other brāhmaṇic literature, but also in the Epics and Purāṇas. He has dealt with it in a fresh manner, independent of preconceived ideas and accepted views, and has brought together a great quantity of new evidence regarding the social conditions of ancient India, that has been hitherto neglected, presenting it generally in new connections and a new light. There can be no doubt that the Mahābhārata and the older Purāṇas, which are largely secular literature, disclose many real features of the ancient society that cannot be discarded or belittled, though they find no place in the priestly literature and differ from the brāhmaṇic presentment, for in any case the existence and preservation of such different notices must be accounted for.

One inference that such independent research appears to elicit is that the Āryans, when they entered India, found in places a degree of civilization as high as their own, if not higher, especially in Oudh and North Bihar; and there need be nothing surprising in that, because it has happened more than once in the history of the world that a more virile tribe has overcome and entered into a higher civilization, and has afterwards carried that on to further excellence.

This book is therefore well worth study, and should help to revise views that may now be held on insufficient grounds.

F. E. PARGITER.

Oxford : *December, 1924.*

AN INTRODUCTORY AND CRITICAL NOTE

[M. Winternitz]

On my way to Nālanda in September 1923, I spent two pleasant days at Pāṭnā,—Pāṭaliputra of Buddhist fame, now one of the principal seats of learning in India,—under the hospitable roof of Dr. S. C. Sarkār. We had many an interesting conversation on problems of Indian literature, and amongst other things he showed me the Manuscript of his Doctor's Dissertation on the Earliest Social History of India. The subject was of the greatest interest to me. Glancing over it I could see that it touched on some subjects which I had myself dealt with several times during the last thirty years,—the first time in my paper on Ancient Indian Marriage Ritual in 1892, and the last time in my essays on Woman in Brāhmaṇism (1920). There was no time to read the dissertation then and there. But Dr. Sarkār kindly gave me a type-written copy of it that I might read it at leisure during my voyage home. This was made impossible by a prolonged illness which befell me after the completion of my happy pilgrimage to and through India, even before I reached the shores of Italy. Thus it was not until Easter 1924 that I could read the dissertation. Now I read it with delighted interest, though in many details I could not agree with the author, and I read it even more than once, in order to re-examine his arguments, where I differed from him. But from the very beginning I highly appreciated the scholarly instinct with which he has extracted from the Vedic texts every little detail that had even the least bearing on social life.

Thus, in the first chapter, on Building of Houses, etc., he is not content with arranging all the passages referring to architectural details, but he collects at the same time everything that can in any way elucidate the economical conditions, and the social and political condition of Ancient India. In the chapter on Household Furniture, and again in that on Dress and Costumes, we find many references to marriage customs and married life, and even to ethnical and racial distinctions. Here he touches, for instance, the vexed question of the Vrātyas, whom he takes to be Easterners and "non-Ailas" (non-Aryans), adopting the terminology of Pargiter. In a paper on the Vrātyas that has just been published (in the Zeitschrift für Buddhismus VI, 1924-25, p. 48 ff.), I have, like Dr. Sarkār, also come to the conclusion that the Vrātyas were neither wandering Sādhus nor Śaiva mendicants, as some scholars have tried to prove, but certain tribes, living outside the pale of Brāhmaṇism, and that there are some indications of their having been Easterners. I do not think, however, that it is possible to decide whether they were Āryans or non-Āryans.

But the most interesting chapters of the dissertation are doubtless those on Sex-relations and the Status of Women in Ancient India. There are many things in these chapters to which I would take exception.

Thus I certainly should not conclude[1] from the Vedic myths that the Ṛṣis of old did not see anything wrong in such connexions as that of Prajāpati with his daughter, or of Pūṣan with his mother and sister. Surely the ancient Greeks did not approve of fathers eating up their children, because according to the Greek myth Kronos devoured his children. I am sure Dr. Sarkār himself would not believe that the Ṛṣi who said that Agni, as soon as born, eats his mothers or parents (jāyamāno mātarā garbho atti: Rv. X. 79, 4), approved of children eating up their parents.[2]

---

[1] I am glad that the learned professor has raised these points, for it would serve to illustrate how it is sometimes difficult even for deep and critical scholarship to completely overcome the subtle influences of ancient prejudices and traditional or preconceived interpretations. I hope however that the footnotes I have ventured to add here may lead to a subsequent modification of the views of a scholar in whose soundness and fairness of judgment I have a very great faith indeed.—AUTHOR.]

[2] It will be noted that my conclusion is not based on any one Vedic myth or two; and one of these so-called myths (viz., that of Prajāpati and his daughter) I have shown to be a brāhmaṇical version of a secular dynastic detail. The basis of my inferences is not only these two references to Pūṣan's or Prajāpati's conduct, but a number of other more distinct allusions in priestly as well as secular historical literature. Incestuous connexions and cannibalism are not analogous or parallel features in the history of civilization; the former may be discovered even in comparatively recent history as an established feature, while the latter, so far as the history of the more civilised races is concerned, can only be inferred from faint echoes in folklore and myths. It cannot however be denied that some ancient Hellenic traditions and myths are echoes of a remote period of barbarism, witchcraft, human sacrifices, and perhaps even of cannibalism. A scientific historian is surely justified in surmising from the Vedic (or rather pre-Vedic) Agni legends, not that the Vedic ṛṣis were cannibals, but that these are relics of a forgotten barbarous age, when the Indian tribes amongst whom fire worship arose (and I have shown them to have been pre-Āryan and Gangetic) still retained racial memories of the well-known primitive practice of eating up the old members of the tribe either after (sacrificial) slaughter or exposure and death. So also it is very likely that the ancient Hellenes found traditions of such a primitive practice lingering amongst the earlier Mediterranean people, which quite naturally found their way into the mixed Greek mythology. Finally it will also be remembered that parental incests were not unknown amongst ancient Greeks and Persians, whose cultural affinities with ancient Indo-Āryans are clear enough. In investigating all such details we should steer clear of the perfectly natural tendency, on the part of native and foreign admirers of Indian civilization in general, of explaining away or ignoring facts not in agreement with later standards or with the measure of their admiration.—AUTHOR.]

The stories told in the late **Jātaka** commentary, not in the old Jātaka gāthās, about **Rāma and Sītā**, cannot prove that Sītā was common wife of **Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa**, nor that Sītā was their sister as well as wife. Generally speaking, though the existence of incestuous marriages must be admitted for Ancient India, as it is found among other ancient peoples, I do not believe that it existed to such an extent as it would appear from the statements made in this dissertation. In my opinion it never was, even in primitive times, a general popular custom, but limited to ruling families or dynasties.[1]

Nor can I approve of the author's explanations of the Gandharva in the wedding mantra: "Somaḥ prathamo vivide Gandharvo vivida uttaraḥ, tritīyo Agniṣ ṭe patis turīyas te manuṣyajāḥ." The exact nature of the Gandharvas is certainly still one of the unsolved problems of Indian mythology and folklore. Still it is clear enough that Soma, the Moon, is considered as the 'husband' of the maiden on account of his regulating the menstruation, and that Agni was called the 'husband' of the bride from whom the mortal husband received her, on account of the time-honoured custom of leading the bride around the fire at the wedding ritual. In the same way the Gandharva Viśvāvasu must somehow be related to the sexual life of woman (the Buddhist Assalāyana Sutta shows that he was connected with conception; see also Rv. X. 85,

---

[1 Here again, Sītā's consanguinity and biandry (or potential polyandry) has not been inferred from only one reference in the Jātakas, but also from many other corroborative allusions there as well as in Epic-Purāṇic literature, taken together with contemporary Vedic evidence on the subject. Occurrence of incestuous marriages "among other ancient peoples" is not however the soundest reason for inferring their existence in ancient India, though of course this has its confirmatory value; it is the first-hand evidence of the priestly and secular historical literatures that I have relied upon. "The statements made in the dissertation" are not fanciful, and references have been given for all statements, which will have to be taken for what they are worth irrespective of the attractiveness or otherwise of the conclusion.—It rather puzzles me that while the equally late and much tampered with Kāvya version of the really ancient Rāmāyaṇic traditions is passed by scholars, the Jātaka or Buddhist version, which from the standpoint of historical criticism is a much sounder source, should be viewed with unmitigated scepticism.—I have not jumped to a conclusion that consanguinous marriages and polyandry were "general popular customs"; I have only suggested that the evidence available points to a frequent occurrence amounting to a custom of such connexions amongst the chief ruling as well as priestly families of the Vedic (=Epic) age.—AUTHOR.]

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

21 f., and Av. IV, 37 f.), and had certainly nothing to do with the higher education of girls.[1]

But I must not enter into further details. The book will doubtless meet with sharp criticism and arouse strong opposition. Some of the conclusions arrived at by the author will be accepted as true, others will have to be rejected. But errors are not only unavoidable, they are more often than not even necessary stages on the way to the discovery of truth, if only the search after truth is carried on in a truly scientific spirit.[2] And even the opponents will admit that this is the case in Dr. Sarkār's dissertation.

Though we may hesitate to ascribe to the traditional genealogies and legends of the Purāṇas so much historical value as our author, a faithful disciple of Mr. Pargiter, ascribes to them, yet as an historian he is fully justified in trying to find out what light the Epic and Purāṇic traditions might throw on the history of the Vedic period. In our days, when some scholars hold that there is no real tradition at all connecting the hymns of the Ṛgveda,—which are believed to have been composed somewhere in Irān, if not still farther West,—with the later Indian literature, it is worth something to have shown that there are after all some threads that lead from the Ṛgveda to the Brāhmaṇas, and from these to the Epics and the Purāṇas.

---

[1] Here the only difference between Dr. Winternitz and myself is that he takes Gandharva to be connected with the sexual life of women, while I take it to be connected with some pre-marital part of woman's life. The Gandharva Viśvāvasu is certainly of a sexual character, but he is also a 'Muse'; besides Viśvāvasu is not named in the mantra in question. That Gandharva is not always a sex-spirit is shown by Vedic references to 'gandharva-gṛhītā' maidens and lady-teachers. There is no real conflict between the two interpretations, for the sexual character of spirits is very closely related in ancient (or even modern) thought with their artistic character. Soma's connection with menstruation would apply equally well, perhaps better, to my view of this wedding mantra: this interpretation of Soma's significance would make the education of girls in music and arts begin with adolescence.—the most suitable age for it; moral discipline or ritual purification (represented by Agni's 'husband-dom') would naturally come after it, leading to real and perfected wifehood. Agni can hardly have been regarded as a husband of the bride simply because the marriage ceremony included going round the fire; the fire was only the divine witness; from the 'sex' poin of view the stone, on which the Vedic bride mounted for the sake of progeny, would be a more suitable candidate for the husband status in the mantra. Agni is very prominently connected with the 'brahmacarya' of boys; why then not of girls, who, as the Av. says, could get properly married only by passing through 'brahmacarya' or a period of education of some sort? If 'gandharva' in the wedding mantra is taken to be a 'conception' spirit, then the absurd result would follow that Vedic society credited every bride with one or more previous conceptions before being led to the fire-altar,—unless it can be shown that this particular mantra (in isolation from the rest) was originally intended for legalising illegitimate connexions with issue thereof, Agni's function being 'śuddhi.'—AUTHOR.]

[2] With these remarks I entirely agree.—AUTHOR.]

Dr. Sarkār, has derived from the Purāṇas many startling facts *and* suggestions, specially as regards the sexual morality of the highest classes of society in ancient times. How far the suggestions will stand the test of criticism and become 'facts' remains to be seen. I am myself rather sceptical about some of these suggestions; yet I cannot help admiring the absolutely unprejudiced and truly historical spirit in which the whole investigation is carried on by the author. And therefore I have great pleasure in recommending the book to all scholars who are interested in the history of Ancient India.

It only remains for me to express the hope that Dr. Sarkār may not be prevented by his official duties from devoting himself to scholarly work and continuing the researches which he has so happily begun.

Prague: *November 9, 1924.*

M. WINTERNITZ.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART I.

SECTION A.

Pages

BUILDING ACTIVITIES (HOUSES, ETC.)— 1—46

Settled life—house property—terms for the dwelling-house: their uses—significance of some house-names derived from features of construction ... ... 1—5

Types of building-construction associated with pastoral and agricultural life—with social life (domestic and public)—with political life—with educational life ... 5—13

Roads—causeways—bridges—fords and rest-houses ... 13—15

Building activities connected with Kings and lesser chieftains ... ... 15—27

Kings, nobles and vassals: castles—the forts and defences of the Dāsas—of the Āryans ... ... 15—22

Fortified towns and capital cities—gateways ... 22—24

Royal establishments—palaces, etc. ... ... 24—27

Constructive activities in the village ... ... 27—28

Features and plan of the Atharva-vedic dwelling-house, (hay, reeds, bamboo, clay, bricks, etc.; wings, verandahs, etc.)—

Identical with the Lower Gangetic "bungalow" style—representing an Eastern, Deltaic, and Brāhmaṇical style of architecture—ancient, indigenous, and with Dravidian affinities ... ... 28—32

Indications of a style of timber architecture—

Characterized by doorways, pillars, etc.—associated use of metals in house-construction—a Middle-Himālayan and submontane style, with Āryan and Mongoloid affinities ... ... 32—35

Indications of a structural style characterized by use of burnt bricks—

altar-construction—varieties of bricks—cement—altar models and sizes—tradition *re* invention of bricks (Iṣṭakā)—the brick-style an advanced and ancient one—traditionally Brāhmaṇical, Lower Gangetic, and with Dravidian affinities ... ... 35—38

Indications of a stone architectural style—

Eastern (heterodox) and Midland (orthodox) styles of 'śmaśāna' construction—the Round and Stone style—the Square and Brick style—prototypes of the Buddhist (Stūpa) and Brāhmaṇical architectures—the Round Stone style belongs to Magadha-Prācī—great antiquity of the 'śmaśāna' structures of Round and Square types—and of the 3 varieties of 'śmaśāna' structures: reliquaries (round or square), memorial buildings, memorial pillars—the prototypes of Buddhistic structures: 'stūpas,' dedicatory buildings, monolithic pillars—the true explanation of the Mauryan stone-architecture—the stone style is Magadhan, non-Brāhmaṇical, proto-Buddhistic, and very ancient ... 38—46

SECTION A.—(*Contd.*) Pages

Summary—

Three well-marked structural styles in the Vedic Age, corresponding to clear ethnic and regional divisions, and agreeing with facts of traditional history ... 46

SECTION B.

FURNITURE, ETC.— 47—56

Nature of references to furniture: ritualistic, brāhmaṇical and indigenous 47

Primitive types of seats in ritual 47

More advanced types of seats—riparian materials—the products of indigenous industries of the Lower Gangetic country ... ... 48—49

Bedsteads, couches, and 'secular' seats: of timber, etc.—sometimes modified with riparian materials in conformity with ritual tradition ... ... 49—50

Varieties of bed-steads, couches and settees—chiefly connected with women ... ... 50—52

The aristocratic seats: 'āsandī' and 'paryaṅka'—

Vrātya and Eastern origin—adopted by Midland ruling families—ritual modifications—summary of descriptions, bringing out the general type of these seats, their different uses, modifications, dimensions and materials 52—56

SECTION C.

DRESS AND COSTUMES— 57—73

(*a*) Variety in materials and manners, due to different regional conditions and tribal peculiarities ... 57

Skins—

Varieties—their use is brāhmaṇical, Vrātya, and aboriginal—use of goatskins primarily and mainly (not sheepskins, etc.).—traces of the ritual use of primitive riparian clothing-materials—these materials indigenous and brāhmaṇical—not Āryan ... ... 57—58

Wool—

Varieties of woollens—use of sheep's wool or woollen stuff not ritual, ancient and Eastern, but secular, later and North-Western (regional peculiarity and industrial traditions)—indigenous use of 'silk-cotton' wool, goat's-hair, etc. (the earlier substitutes of 'woollens') 58—60

Silk—

Frequenter use of silk (indigenous in N. E. Deccān and adjacent Gangetic country) in ritual—rare use of 'barken' stuff (N.-W. Himālayas)—significance ... 60—61

91-112

SECTION A. (*Contd.*)

Pages

(*ii*) Features of the normal marriage-forms ... ... 91—102

Child-marriage unknown—stages of its subsequent development 91

Evidence *re* marriageable age and free love-matches bet. grown up *parties* ... ... 91—94

Opportunities for pre-marital loves—social freedom ... 94—96

Extent of parental control : limits and exceptional cases 97—98

A great variety of normal forms of marriage—tribal customs, etc.,—the so-called 'Vedic' marriage does not describe any *one* type ... ... 98—99

The variety also due to manners of settling a match, and exceptional conditions ... ... 99—101

Marriages not restricted to specified groups—consanguinity no bar—subsequent restrictions—'intercaste' marriages frequent—hypergamy not the main form ... .. 101—102

(*iii*) Social position and relations of women ... ... 103—112

Significance of Vedic terms denoting woman—indicative of her status and relations ... ... 103—104

Attitude towards female births—no infanticide ... 104—105

Relation between daughters and parents : honour, appreciation, concern for marriage, domestic work, leisure and liberty for social enjoyments, consideration for old maids, property and dowry, 'rich' daughters, better legal position ... ... 106—108

Personal and social freedom of the daughter—initiative in love affairs—some fraternal control—social equality in sex-relations ... ... 108—109

Admission of women to highest education—indications of regular systems of schooling for girls—unmarried women teachers ... ... 109—110

The allegory of the 'life-stages' of a woman—ever in a state of marriage ... ... 111—112

SECTION B.

Evidence of 'bardic tradition' *re* primitive sex-relations and special customs ... ... 113—225

(*a*) Introductory—

General agreement with evidence of priestly lit.—explanation of the nature of traditional evidence, its value and the proper standpoint from which to view it ... 113—116

61-70

SECTION C.—(*Contd.*) Pages.

Cotton-weaving—

Fully developed and long-standing indigenous industry—very prominent in earliest brāhmaṇical texts—appliances and products same as those of the well-known Gangetic cotton manufacturers (Dravidian affinities) the 'vāsas' and its parts, described and identified (with the traditional 'dhūti' and 'sārī')—similar varieties of borders, fringes, colours, etc. ... ... 61—64

Manner of wearing the 'vāsas'—

The various styles of doing the "nīvi"—the true meaning of 'nīvi'—the Vrātya style—women's style—later parallels ... ... 64—66

Upper garments, over-garments, etc., of men and women: Varieties and uses of scarfs, veils, cloaks, tight jackets, bust-bodices, etc.,—described and identified—'atka,' 'peśas' and 'śāmulya,' specially brāhmaṇical and indigenous—adoptively Indo-Irānian ... ... 66—68

The turban—

Non-brāhmaṇical—Vrātya origin—used by ruling classes—ritual modifications—brāhmaṇical head-bands—women's head-bands—non-Āryan affinities ... ... 68—69

Foot-wear—

Early use in martial equipment only—use and materials of shoes in ritual—apparently **non-brāhmaṇical** (excluded by foot-ornaments)—specially **used** by Vrātyas 69—70

Prevalent fashions of hair-dressing—

Naturally excluding turbans—a specially brāhmaṇical feature—brāhman clans (and indigenous gods) with distinctive styles of hair-dressing—the various styles affected by women—styles common to both sexes—those specially feminine—descriptions—Dravidian affinities ... 70—73

PART II.

SECTION A.

Pages

Evidence of priestly literature *re*— 74—112

- **(i) Traces of primitive sex-relations and special customs** ... 74—90
  - **(*a*) Brother-sister marriage** ... ... 74—75; 76—78
  - **(*b*) Parental incest** ... ... 75—76
  - **(*c*) Polyandry** ... ... 78—81
  - **(*d*) 'Niyoga' (levirate)** ... ... 78—79
  - **(*e*) Widow-burning and Widow-remarriage** ... ... 82—83; 83—84
  - **(*f*) Polygamy** ... ... 84—90

SECTION B.—(*Contd.*)

Pages

(*b*) Purāṇic illustrations, and critical estimates of the two sets of evidences re— ... 116—225

- (*i*) Brother-sister marriage ... . 116—135
- (*ii*) Parental incest ... ... 136—144
- (*iii*) Polyandry ... ... 145—162
- (*iv*) 'Niyoga' (levirate) ... ... 163—185
- (*v*) Widow-remarriage and Widow-burning ... 186—197
- (*vi*) Polygamy ... ... 198—225

BUILDING ACTIVITIES :

(Houses, etc.)

THE Vedic Āryans very early ceased to be wandering tribes: the Ṛgveda shows them indeed still conquering, but they have already begun internecine wars and struggles for overlordships[1]; and fighting does not involve constant shiftings of abode. Permanent settlements, of the nature of marks,[2] are normal in the Ṛgveda, being the 'kṣitir dhruvā'[3] or the fixed secure abode of the clans; such were the 'viś' (in its special sense),[4] the 'stha'[5] (inferable in the early 'goṣṭha,'[6] or the later 'sthapati'),[7] the 'vṛjanas'[8] and the 'vrājas.'[9] It is a settled life that could give the home its appropriate epithet of 'pratiṣṭhā'[10] or establishment, standing, fixed abode; so also, one desiring to lead a settled home-life of his own is called 'pratiṣṭhā-kāma.'[11] Such a settled home is already the nucleus round which the Vedic society and polity develops. Religion, law and custom was thus based on home-life, and the individualistic tendency of the Indo-Āryan found expression in, and grew out of the importance he attached to the home.

Already in the early Vedic times, houses were not simply unit family abodes, but were also individual private properties, which could be acquired[12]; and sometimes a ready-made house could be purchased for a considerable price[13]; a well-to-do person possessed several houses; thus a rich householder is called 'pastyāvant,'[14] and some poet-singers are described as 'puru-dama'[15]; so also (later on) fields and 'āyatanas'[16] are given as examples of prosperity.

The great variety of Vedic words denoting a dwelling-house is a reflection of its importance to the Vedic Indians, and shows that they were long settled, with a tradition of house-building. 'Gaya' is a common word[17] in the Ṛgveda for the house or household, inclusive of the inmates and their belongings; so is ‘ dama ’[1] (and ‘ dam ’) meaning house or home, implying an idea of control,[2] or possibly of building[3]; ‘ dhāman,’[4] another word for a dwelling or house, also signifies on the one hand ‘ the inmates of the house,’[5] and on the other ‘ law or ordinance,’[6] showing the connexion in the Vedic mind between the house and all conceptions of law and order.[7] ‘ Śarma ’[8] is a house as a comfortable place, ‘ mahi ’ (big) and ‘ smat ’ (fine), within the ‘ viś ’ or ‘ vṛjana.’ ‘ Gṛha,’[9] the family home is contrasted[10] with ‘ jana ’ and ‘ viś,’ just as the family sacrifice is contrasted[11] with the sacrifice of the ‘ jana ’ or ‘ viś,’ the individualism of the home being clearly recognized. ‘ Kula ’ in the compound ‘ kulapā ’ (used of the house-protector or family-chief,[12] and the home-staying[13] old maid) conveyed the sense of the dwelling-house of a small individual family, a sense which also occurs in the post-Vedic use[14] of the word singly: though later on the word acquired an added special meaning of ‘ sanctuary or temple.’[15] ‘ Vasati ’[16] and ‘ niveśana, ’[17] seem on the other hand to have been terms without special significance : the former probably remained so all along,[18] but the latter is used in the Epic and the Purāṇas in the sense of a flourishing or fresh ‘ colonial settlement,’[19] and in the Sūtras in a curious optional sense of ‘ resting-place or stall for cattle ’ as opposed to the ‘ gṛha ’ used by men.[20]

---

[1] As the Purāṇic tradition amply shows.

[2] Cf. Roth: Dict., s.v. 'vṛjana.'

[3] Cf. Rv. I, 73, 4; VII, 88, 7; Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 142.

[4] E.g. where 'gṛha' is contrasted with 'viś': Rv. X, 91, 2; cf. VII, 82, 1.

[5] Cf. the Germanic 'Stadt.'

[6] Vide infra.

[7] Cf. Kāt. Śr. Sūt. I, 1. 12; Weber: Ind. Stud. 10, 13.

[8] Rv. I. 51. 15; 73. 2.4: 91, 21; 105, 19; 128, 7; 165, 15; 166, 14; etc.; VII, 32, 27; X, 42. 10; etc.

[9] Rv. X. 179, 2=Av. VII, 72, 2.

[10] Av. VI. 32, 3=VIII, 8, 21=Śāṅkh. Āraṇ. XII, 14. (Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 181, sees in it a legal term, but cf. St. Pet. Dict.).

[11] Taitt. Saṃ. II, 1. 3.4; Pañc. Brā. XXIII, 19. 1; etc.

[12] Cf. 'vidatha'; also n. 4, p. 4.

[13] Av. IX. 3. 15.

[14] Rv. I. 151. 2; IX, 97. 18 (prob.).

[15] Av. VII. 73. 1.

[16] Chānd. Upan. VII. 24, 2.

[17] Rv. I, 74, 2; V, 10, 3; 44. 7; VI, 2, 8, etc.; Av. VI, 3, 3 Vāj. Saṃ. XXVII, 3.

---

[1] Rv. I, 1, 8; 61, 9; 75, 5; 143, 4; II, 1, 2; etc.; Vāj. Saṃ. VIII, 24

[2] Cf. Roth : St. Pet. Dict. s.v. ‘ dama.’

[3] Cf. V.I., 1, 340, s.v. ‘ dama.’

[4] Rv. I, 144, 1; II, 3, 2; III, 55, 10; VIII, 61, 4; 87, 2; X, 13, 1; etc.; Av. IV, 25, 7; VII, 68, 1; XII, 1, 52; Vāj. Saṃ. IV, 34; Taitt. Saṃ. II, 7, 2.

[5] Rv. VIII, 101, 6; IX, 36, 14; X, 82, 3; Av. II, 14, 6; (cf. St. Pet. Dict. s.v., c.).

[6] Rv. IV, 55, 2; VI, 21, 3; VII, 63, 3; VIII, 41, 10; X, 48, 11.

[7] Which also comes out in the Ṛgvedic expression ‘ ṛta-dhāman.’ (Rv. I, 123, 9; IV, 7, 7; VII, 36, 5; X, 124, 3).

[8] Rv. VII, 82, 1; I, 51, 15.

[9] See also infra. for other uses of this term.

[10] Rv. X, 91, 2.

[11] Rv. VII, 82, 1.

[12] Rv. X, 179, 2.

[13] Av. I, 14, 3; etc.

[14] Śat. Brā. I, 1, 2, 22; II. 1, 4. 4; 4. 1. 14; XI, 5. 3, 11; 8. 1, 3; XIII, 4, 2, 7; Bṛhad. Upan. I, 5, 32; Chānd. Upan. III, 13 6. etc.

[15] E.g. in ‘ deva-kula ’; cf. ‘ guru-kula.’ But cf. ‘ kula vadhū ’ and cognate forms.

[16] Rv. I. 31, 15; V, 2, ; Vāj. Saṃ. XVIII, 15; Taitt. Brā. II, 3, 5, 4; III. 7. 3, 3; etc.

[17] Rv. IV. 19. 9; VII. 19. 5; (sense of colonial settlement possible—“after destroying 99 cities. Indra entered the 100th for ‘ niveśana ’ ”).

[18] But in Mārk. Pur. XLIX, 49—50, ‘ vasati ’ is given the technical sense of mart or trading settlement or quarter of a town. Cf. Eastern vern. ‘ vesāti = mart, merchandise, etc. Cf. also Ṛgvedic ‘ vasna ’ and vern. ‘ vāsan.’

[19] This however may have been equally a Vedic sense (vide n. 17 above); and the ‘ Sūtra ’ sense could be derived from it owing to the connection of cattle-stalls with fresh colonial settlements.

[20] Āśval. Gṛh. Sūt. IV, 6; etc.

'Pastyā' (f)[1] or 'pastya' (n),[2] occurring singly, or in the compounds 'pastyā-vant,'[3] 'pastya-vant'[3] and 'pastya-sad,'[4] are other terms denoting a house or dwelling, and hence family, while in the feminine form even the goddess of the homestead may be so designated.[5] 'Pastyā' was occasionally also applied to the 'stall for horses,' the whole being used for a part, e.g., in 'aśva-pastya'[6] and 'pastyā-vant marya'[7]; but it had usually, along with 'harmya,'[8] a special significance of 'the home with all its adjuncts and surroundings,' 'the family settlement,' apparently a nobleman's abode (having stables, etc.). 'Vāstu' seems to mean simply 'dwelling-house' or 'settlements generally'[9] in the compound epithet 'su-vāstu'[10]; but in 'vāstoṣ-pati'[11] it approaches the later (even modern) and more special meaning of 'the site of a house'[12]; these imports of 'a group of houses' or 'settlement,' and of 'a site presided over by some deity,' are also conveyed by 'pastyā' in several passages.[13] 'Māna' is a house as being a measured structure, wherein the house-builder saw a spirit 'mānasya patnī,' mistress of the house-structure.[14] 'Āyatana,' 'enclosure,' had an earlier general sense of 'abode' or 'home,'[15] but later on was specialized in use, like 'kula,' and referred to some sacred structure within such enclosure.[15] 'Viś' is a term which gradually narrowed in significance, from 'settlement'[16] to 'the assembly-hall of the settlement,' and then to 'any house,' -as is shown by the uses of the compounds 'viś-pati'[1] and 'viś-patnī.'[2] A cognate term 'veśman'[3] denotes 'house as the place where one is settled.' House or holding in its aspect of acquired property,[4] is designated by 'vidatha'; but its specialized derivative meanings are quite early and manifold, amongst which may be noted those of 'asylum,'[5] 'family assembly or sacrifice,'[5] 'a smaller[7] or secular assembly,'[8] 'a rich or royal establishment like palaces.'[9]

---

[1] Rv. I, 25. 10; 40, 7; 164, 30; IV, 1. 11; VI, 49, 9; VII, 97, 5; IX, 65, 23; X. 46, 6; (also corresponding passages in Yv.).

[2] Rv. X, 96, 10.11; cf. VIII, 39. 8; VI. 58. 2; IX. 98. 12; V. 50. 4.

[3] Rv. I, 151, 2; IX, 97, 18; II, 11, 16; IV, 54, 5; VIII, 7, 29; (IV, 55, 3; VIII, 27. 5).

[4] Rv. VI, 51, 9; Roth, St. Pet. Dic., s.v.; Pischel: Ved. Stud. 2. 211.

[5] Rv. IV, 55, 3; VIII, 27, 5.

[6] Rv. IX, 86, 41; Av. VI, 77, 1; XIX, 55, 1.

[7] Rv. IX, 97, 18; prob. I, 91, 13.

[8] Cf. V.I., I, 229, '30; Rv. VII, 56. 16; cf. X. 106. 5.

[9] Cf. the similar use of vern. 'vasti' (from 'vasati').

[10] Rv. VIII, 19, 17; (Nir. IV, 15).

[11] E.g. in Taitt. Saṃ. III. 4, 10; cf. Macdonell: Ved. Myth., 138; Zimmer Alt. Leb., 236.

[12] As opposed to the 'kṣetra,' holding, also presided over by a deity; cf. Rv. IV. 37. 1, 2; etc., Av. II, 12. 1; etc.

[13] E.g. in Rv. VIII. 7. 29: VIII. 27. 5; IV. 55. 3; respectively; cf. Pischel's explanation of 'pastyā'=a river, having groups of houses on its banks.

[14] Av. IX, 3; III, 12; cf. the later structural technical terms: 'vāstumāna' (in Pur.). 'māna-sāra' (the treatise).

[15] E.g. in Chānd. Upan. VII. 24. 2; so also in the Epic; it is applied subsequently to temples and monasteries enclosed by walls.

[16] Rv. IV. 4, 3; 37. 1: V. 3, 5; VI, 21, 4; 48, 8; VII, 56. 22; 61, 3; 70, 3; 104, 18; X, 91, 2; etc. (But in some of these the sense of 'dwelling-house' may also suit.)

A few common house-names were derived from ordinary features of building construction, such as 'āyatana,'[10] referring to the enclosing walls, railings or fencings; or 'duroṇa,'[11] 'gateway,' secondarily implying a house as characterized by such a feature. Another structural term is 'śālā,' primarily a thatch of 'paddy-straw,'[12] for shelter of men or their cattle and stores, then the 'homestead inclusive of such stalls and sheds,'[13] and finally 'house' generally, as in 'śālāpati,' 'house-holder,'[14] or even a section or a single room of a house, as in 'patnī-śāla'[15] or 'agni-śāla'[15]; apparently it came to be quite early used of flourishing and wealthy residences as well, as indicated by names of princes and noted priests, like 'Mahāsāla' ('big-housed') 'Prācīsa-śāla' ('ancient-housed')[1]

---

[1] Rv. I, 12, 2; 26, 7; 164, 1; II, 1, 8; III, 2, 10; 40, 3; VII, 39, 2; IX, 108, 10; X, 4, 4; 135, 1; etc.; cf. also VIII, 55, 5=Av. IV, 5, 6.

[2] Taitt. Saṃ. III, 1, 11, 4.

[3] Rv. X, 107, 10; 146,3; Av. V, 17, 13; IX, 6, 30; Ait. Brā. VIII, 24, 6.

[4] J. Am. Or. S., 19, 12ff.; cf. Rv. I, 117, 25; II, 1, 6; X, 85, 26.27; Av. XVIII, 3, 70.

[5] Ludwig: Trans. Rv. 3, 261; cf. Śat. Brā. V, 3, 1, 13, and Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XV, 3, 35; cf. also Rv. I, 31, 6; V, 62, 6; Ait. Brā. I, 30, 27.28.

[6] According to Bloomfield and V.I.; cf. connexion of women chiefly with this, but rarely with the 'sabhā'; cf. also Rv. X, 85, 26.27; Av. VII, 38, 4; Mait. Saṃ. IV, 7, 4.

[7] Zimmer: Alt. Leb., 177; Rv. II, 27, 12.

[8] According to Roth; Rv. II, 1, 4; 27, 12.17; III, 38, 5.6; V, 63, 2; VII, 66, 10; VIII, 39, 1; X, 12, 7; Av. I, 13, 4; XVII, 1, 15.

[9] Rv. IV, 27, 2; cf. I, 91, 20; 167, 3; Av. XX, 128, 1.

[10] Vide n. 15, p. 3.

[11] Vide p. 32, n. 4—5, and p. 33, n. 1—4; 'dur,' 'durya' and 'duryoṇa' also have a similar secondary sense.

[12] As 'śālā' is a term practically confined to the Av. (vide infra.), it is highly probable that it represents some indigenous word, presumably the same as the Eastern vern. 'cālā,' of equivalent form, and of exactly the same significances ('cālā' and 'cāl' also having a common figurative sense of house, room, etc.); E. vern. 'cāl' (rice) corresponds to Sans. 'śāli'; cf. 'vicāli'= straw, i.e. 'taken out of śāli or paddy plants'; for E. vern. 'c'=Sans. 'ś,' cf. infra.,—'kaśipu'=Tamil 'kacci-pā.'

[13] Av. III, 12, 1ff; V, 31, 5; VI, 106, 3; VIII, 6, 10; IX, 3, 1ff; XIV, 1, 63; Taitt. Brā. I, 2, 3, 1; Śat. Brā. III, 1, 1, 6; etc.

[14] Av. IX, 3, 12.

[15] Vide pp. 30-31.

It is significant that 'śālā,' etc., do not occur even once in the Rv., while almost all the references to them belong to the Av., which applies this term also to a particular type of 'straw and bamboo' house[2] whose construction it describes. On the other hand 'durona,' etc., are specially Ṛgvedic terms, while 'āyatana' belongs to the Upaniṣads and the Epic. In the comparatively drier and hotter Upper Gangetic regions, the 'entrance' and 'enclosure' aspects[3] of the dwelling-house must have been naturally more prominent[4] than the protective covering overhead: and the references to these features and their figurative use, accordingly, occur in texts that were mainly of Midlandic origin; again, it is only in the rain-flooded Lower Gangetic country that the roof is naturally all-important, and has to be built carefully[5]: and accordingly, the 'śālā' (thatch) is prominent, and means the house itself, in texts that were largely of Eastern Gangetic (and indigenous) origin. So also in subsequent developments of Indian architecture,[6] these two main styles may be recognized: one characterized by various modifications of the 'enclosure'[7] and the 'gateway',[8] another by those in roofing[9]; and it is remarkable that 'roof' architecture throughout the greater part of India (and in all periods) bears a distinct stamp of the Lower Gangetic 'cālā' (śālā), whether we look to the dome of the 'stūpa,'[10] the convex 'śaiva'[11] roof with projecting eaves, or the curved and tapering 'vaiṣṇava'[11] 'śikhara.'

It is quite in accordance with the pre-eminently agricultural and pastoral character of early Vedic life that the house is at first very closely associated with the stalls for domestic animals. Thus the cowstall, the wagon and the house are mentioned together[1] in the same breath as it were. ' Sālā '[2] and ' pastya(ā) '[3] imply accommodation of some sort for both men and their beasts.[4] ' Gotra ' and ' vra(ā)ja,' all originally arrangements for accommodation of cattle, were so intimately connected with the ordinary life of their possessors, that these names came to be employed equally or almost at the same time with reference to men. Thus vrāja,'[5] pen, also denotes a pastoral settlement (under a chief)[6] including many ' kulas ' and ' vrajas ' (in the narrower sense); in subsequent literature also (classical and modern), vraja ' (possibly also the representative of the older ' vṛjana ')[7] has the regular sense of a closely organized pastoral settlement with the human and bovine elements equally prominent.[8] What the ' vraja ' originally was, does not clearly appear: Geldner derives it from ' vraj,' to go, giving it the primary meaning of pasture, while Roth prefers the derivation from ' vṛj,'[9] which gives the primary meaning of enclosure or pen; probably both senses are mixed up in the passages where it occurs; the later (vernacular) use of ' vraja '[10] agrees with this view: the frequently occ~~urring~~ sense of pen[11] or stall[12] cannot be derived from ' vraj,' to go, but the sense of ' pasture '[13] is possible from vṛj ' to enclose; for a common pasture may very well have been an enclosure with a hedge, fence or palisade; it seems that such a defensible ' enclosure ' with palisade and gateway,[14] rather than a ' pen ' with fence and latch, is referred to in ' sārgala ' and ' sapariśraya ' ' vraja '[15]: the sense of a protected pastoral settlement can easily evolve out of this. The ' vraja,' when a cowstall is meant by it, was made of Aśvattha[16] wood, well built to make it warm,[17] and had doors whose wide sweep[18] suggested conceptions like that of the dawn opening wide the doors of the ' vraja ' of darkness, or Death being ' vrāja-bāhu.'[19] ' Gotra ' is supposed by Geldner

---

[1] E.g. Sat. Brā. X, 3, 3, 1; 6, 1, 1; Chānd. Upan. V, 11, 1; Muṇḍ. Upan. I, 1, 3; cf. the early royal names 'Mahā-śāla' and 'Vi-śāla' in the Purāṇic dynastic lists.

[2] Vide infra., p. 28ff.

[3] Cf. the sense of 'enclosure' in 'vṛjana' and 'vraja,' which is also described as 'sārgala' and 'sapariśraya' (with gate and palisade); vide infra.; these terms also are specially Ṛgvedic.

[4] As it is even to-day.

[5] As the modern 'P.W.D.' knows very well.

[6] E.g. in Mauryan and post-Mauryan examples.

[7] E.g. the timber palisades or stone-railings.

[8] E.g. the famous 'toraṇa,' a form comparable to 'duroṇa,' which may have been the prototype,—an ornamental gateway, instead of an ordinary 'dvār (a).'

[9] E.g. the so-called 'barrel-shaped' tops of monasteries, etc.

[10] In Buddhist—i.e. Magadhan styles.

[11] Miscalled 'Dravidian' and 'Indo-Āryan' respectively by Fergusson; really they are both developments from the same Bengal thatch or 'cālā,' adapted to local conditions (vide Havell's works for proper interpretation).

[1] Av. II, 14, 2.

[2] Cf. n. 13, p. 4.

[3] Cf. n. 6, and n. 7, p. 3.

[4] Specially horses in the latter case.

[5] Kauṣ. Brā. II, 9 (in the sense of ' pen,' the other form ' vraja ' is much more common in earlier Vedic lit.).

[6] Rv. X, 179, 2; Av. VII, 72, 2.

[7] Cf. n. 8, p. 1.

[8] E.g. in all literature dealing with Kṛṣṇa episodes.

[9] St. Pet. Dict., s.v.

[10] As a pastoral yet compact and organized settlement.

[11] Av. III, II, 15; IV, 38, 7; Śaṅkh. Āraṇ. II, 16; probably Rv. X, 97, 10; 101, 8.

[12] Rv. X, 4, 2; cf. IV, 51, 2; Taitt. Brā. III, 8, 12, 2; Vāj. Saṃ. I, 25.

[13] Probably in Rv. II, 38, 8; X, 26, 3; (cf the derivative sense of ' herd ' in other passages cited in n. 4, V.I., II, 340).

[14] Cf. ' gomatī ' ' purs ' or forts, infra.

[15] Bṛhad. Upan. (Mādh.), VI, 4, 22. (These may have been the original models of the Jaina and Buddhist 'pinjrapoles,' which represent such ' vrajas ' rather closely)

[16] Taitt. Bra. III, 8, 12, 2; (cf. Vāja. Saṃ. I, 25).

[17] Rv. X, 4, 2.

[18] Rv. IV, 51, 2.

[19] Kauṣ. Brā. II, 9.

to have the primary meaning of ‘ herd,’[1] which alone he thinks would explain its later use as ‘ family ’ or ‘ clan.’[2] But Roth's interpretation of it as ‘ cowstall ’ as a structure[3] is better: firstly, as the suffix ‘ tra ’ is also indicative of place; secondly, as the sense of a whole clan can easily be derived from the sense of a cowstall, common and spacious, where a whole clan kept their cattle[4]; and thirdly, as ‘ goṣṭha ’[5] is similarly used of the Bharata clan, and ‘ goṣṭhī ’[5] later on, by a similar transition, comes to mean a social circle. Geldner thinks that in all passages where ‘ goṣṭha ’ occurs,[6] the sense of ‘ grazing ground ’ is better and suits all.[7] But here again, Whitney's and Bloomfield's rendering of stall or stable[8] is more appropriate, as the ‘ stha ’ points to some sort of a standing structure, a stand or stall, and cannot, evidently, refer to ‘ grazing ’: so that ‘goṭsha ’ would mean literally the standing place for cows. It is significant that even in modern vernacular ‘ goṭha ’ is always contrasted with ‘ māṭha ’ (meadow), with which it is combined to form a phrase. The use of ‘ goṭsha ’ in Ait. Brā.[9] is interesting: the cows of the Bharatas are there said to be in the ‘ goṣṭha ’ at evening and in the ‘ saṃgavinī ’ at mid-day: Sāyaṇa adds in explanation (not very clear in itself) that their milch-cows were kept at night in ‘ śālās,’ but the rest of the cattle in the ‘ goṣṭha.’ Here ‘ goṣṭha ’ cannot mean open pasturage; and ‘ saṃgavinī ’ also seems to be some sort of an open shed where the noon-tide milking was done; ‘ goṣṭha ’ and ‘ saṃgavinī ’ therefore would mean cowstalls and cattle-sheds attached to the clan-abodes and set up in the fields, respectively, while the ‘ śālās ’ may have been special sheds for milch-cows with isolated compartments or each such cow may have been isolated in its separate ‘ śālā.’[10] It would also appear that the ‘ goṣṭha ’ belonged to the whole clan, e.g., of the Bharatas,[11] and not to the

[1] Geldner: Ved. Stud. 2, 275-276.

[2] Cf. Chānd. Upan. IV, 4, 1; Śāṅkh. Śr. Sūt. I, 4, 16; etc.; Āśval. Gṛh. Sūt. IV, 4; etc.; Kauṣ. Brā. XXV, 15; etc. (It is to be noted that Purāṇic tradition places the rise of noted ‘ ṛṣi gotras ’ (clans) much earlier than the period indicated by these references. Thus the ‘ clan ’ sense is not a late one.)

[3] St. Pet. Dict., s.v.

[4] The suitability of such interpretation is evident in Rv. I, 51, 3; II, 17, 1; 23, 18; III, 39, 4; 43, 7; VIII, 74, 5; X, 48, 2; 103, 7.

[5] Vide infra.

[6] Rv. I, 191, 4; VI, 28, 1; VIII, 43, 17=Av. III, 14, 1.5.6; II, 26, 2=Vāja. Saṃ. III, 21: V, 17.—Kāṭh. Saṃ. VIII, 7; Mait. Saṃ. IV, 2, 11=Ait. Brā. III, 18, 4; Śat. Brā. XI, 8, 3, 2,; etc.

[7] Sp. in Av. III, 14.

[8] In Av. op. cit.

[9] Ait. Brā. III, 18, 14.

[10] Cf. ‘ śālā,’ ante, p. 4, n. 13.

[11] Examples of ruling and influential priestly families possessing large herds of cattle (often with special structures for these) are well-known in Epic-Purāṇic tradition, and the Bharatas are actually amongst them

individual houses or holdings; and it is thus very probable that the gradually more and more specialized social association and unit of the 'goṣṭhī,' often mentioned later, in Buddhist and classical literature,[1] grew out of the merry clan-gatherings at the 'goṣṭha' in the evening after the day's toil and adventures in the fields and pastures.[2]

Just as the later 'club-house'[3] (goṣṭhī) was developed out of the common cattle-stand, so also some other types of associations and their suitable structures were closely connected with ordinary domestic conditions. 'Vidatha' must be derived from 'vid,' to acquire, rather than from 'vid,' to know, which gives the plausible meaning of something like the Witan to the 'vidatha,' but which can account for only a few of its many senses; 'vidatha' therefore originally meant holding or house[4]; but it is very often used in wider senses, involving the ideas of a larger structure and some sort of assemblage. Thus in different passages Ludwig sees the sense of a sanctuary or asylum,[5] and Zimmer that of a smaller assembly than the 'samiti'[6]; where a 'Samrāṭ' is spoken of as 'vidathya,'[7] the 'vidatha' must have been a royal establishment, a court or audience-hall; where women are connected with the 'vidatha'[8] (but not usually with the 'sabhā'), it may mean a household assembly, social or religious, and the accommodation for such an assembly; while Roth makes out a reference to some secular wider type of assembly in many other passages.[9] 'Vidatha' accordingly stands for quite a variety of building structures, from probably the quadrangle or large hall of a homestead to specialized structures suitable for public use or court life.

[1] Various aspects of the 'goṣṭhī,' economic and social, are indicated and detailed in the early Pāli texts, Kauṭilya, and Vāts. Kā. Sūtra; the term has subsequently degenerated into the colloquial vernacular 'guṣṭh(ṭ)ī.'

[2] The traditional picture of Kṛṣṇa's early life (in some of the Purāṇas also) is an illustration of how this development may have actually happened.

[3] This is the special sense in Buddhist and post-Mauryan literature (e.g. in Vāts. Kā. Sūt.).

[4] J. Am. Or. S., 19, 12ff.; cf. Rv X, 85. 26.27; I, 117. 25; II, 1, 6; Av, XVIII, 3. 70.

[5] Ludwig: Trans. Rv. 3. 261; cf. Śat. Brā. V. 3, 1, 13; Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XV, 3, 35; also Rv. I, 31, 6; V, 62, 6; Ait. Brā. I, 30, 27.28.

[6] Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 177; Rv. II, 27, 12.

[7] Rv. IV, 27, 2; cf. I, 91. 20; 167, 3; AV, XX, 128, 1.

[8] Av. VII, 38, 4; Mait. Saṃ. IV, 7, 4; cf. Rv. X, 85, 26.27 (=Av. XIV, I, 20.26)

[9] Rv. II, 1, 4; 27. 12.17; III, 38, 5.6; V, 63, 2; VII, 66, 10; VIII, 39, 1; X, 12, 7; Av. I, 13, 4; XVII, 1, 15.

The well-known ' sabhā ' is no less ambiguous in significance: the usually accepted view is that it denotes the ' assembly ' of the Vedic Indians as well as the ' hall ' where it met; Hillebrandt however thinks that the ' sabhā ' designates primarily the ' house of assembly ' while ' samiti (also frequently occurring in Vedic literature) stands for the ' assembly '[1] itself; but it is noteworthy that while the ' sabhā ' has a number of functions and aspects[2] ascribed to it in the Vedic literature, the most particular detail available about the ' samiti ' is that kings and princes frequented them[3]: hence the ' samiti ' was more a political institution than the ' sabhā,' and of a select character, though the ' viś ' are associated with both.[4] According to this view the ' sabhā ' would be the hall of the widest assembly of a community and the ' vidatha ' the quadrangle or hall of the unit family assembly; and ' samiti ' would have to be placed between these two types. In fact the ' vidatha ' does develop into the ' samiti ' type: for in some passages the ' vidatha ' may have the developed sense of a public sanctuary or asylum,[5] and in some others[6] the ' samrāṭ ' is ' vidathya ' or ' holding court,' in of course a suitable place: this latter use would correspond to the ' samiti ' associated chiefly with princes. In the Av. the ' sabhā ' and the ' samiti ' are frequently mentioned together,[7] as equally ancient institutions[8] (where prepared speeches were made),[9] which were to be found even in villages[10]; while both were mainly composed of tribesmen and followed the King, the former was associated with the army, and the latter with ' strong drink '[11]; and the ' sabhā,' ' samiti,' and ' āmantraṇa ' are mentioned as assembly-houses in order of increasing limitation.[12] On the whole therefore the ' samiti ' seems to have been a narrower institution. But there are other difficulties: there seem to have been several types of the ' sabhā ' itself. Though it is possible to conclude that all the multifold functions attributed to the ' sabhā ' in different contexts were performed in one and the same institution and structure called ' sabhā,' a state of affairs natural in primitive polity[1] (cf. Hellenic parallels), yet it is reasonable to suppose that increasing complexity of functions very soon (even before the age of the later Saṃhitās) led to a division into several correlated institutions also called ' sabhās.' Thus, for example, the increase of gambling, so closely associated with the ' sabhā ' from the very beginning, would in all likelihood lead to the growth of a type of special gambling halls, where this would not interfere with other more serious functions of the ' sabhā '; the everpresent and expert gamblers, the ' sabhā-sthāṇus '[2] would then leave the assessors, the ' sabhāsads ' undisturbed in their judicial dignity; the two sets cannot very well be posited of the same hall at the same time. So also, we hear of the ' sabhāvin,'[3] the keeper of the gambling hall, as distinct from the ' sabhāpāla,'[4] the warden of the assembly-hall; and of the ' grāmyavādin,'[5] the village judge or town-reeve, in his ' sabhā,' or court, which is here apparently separate from the gambling hall. Then again, certain other early uses of the word ' sabhā ' would necessitate either a supposition that it was evolved out of domestic or individual household conditions, or one that we have in these instances a particular domestic use of the word. Thus when ' Agni ' of the ' sabhā ' is specially designated ' viśpati,' or master of the dwelling,[6] there is an evident reference to domestic conditions. In some passages in the later Saṃhitās (and subsequently) the ' sabhā ' evidently refers to the ' society-room ' in a private dwelling-house[7]; and earlier still, ' sabheya '[8] and ' sabhāvān rayiḥ '[9] seem to have been used domestically; while in ' sabhāvatī yoṣā,'[10] of the Rv., though it is equally permissible to see in it a reference to the presence of women in the greater assemblies, the use is probably a domestic one, meaning something like ‘ the lady in the drawing-room.’ It would thus appear that, whichever be the earlier model, the sitting-room of a private home had much in common with the wider assembly hall, and that the structure and equipment of the ‘ sabhā,’ domestic or public, was of one and the same type originally. So also, both the central hall of a dwelling-house and the assembly hall had their fire-altars,[1] the prototypes of the later ‘ worship-room ’ (‘ ṭhākur-ghar ’) in private houses, of the nave (‘ caitya ’) in the Buddhist congregation halls, and of the sacred antechamber (‘ ṭhākur-dālān ’) in assembly halls of all descriptions (e.g. the ‘ nāṭya-śālā ’ or ‘ nāṭ-mandir ’) : the difference being probably only in the size and type of the altar or other sacred symbol and in the number and variety of the ‘ sthāṇus ’ or pillars. The ‘ sabhā ’ in its wider sense must have been a large edifice with some pretensions to architecture ; apart from the altar[2] and pillars,[3] there must have been more or less suitable structural arrangements for the transaction of judicial, commercial and political business, and reception of courtly, well-born, wealthy persons and kings ; and the complexity of the structure must have been greater where the same building was used for the other ‘ sabhā ’-ic functions,—gambling, merriment, social intercourse, debates and contests.[4] Probably when the social and festive branch of the ‘ sabhā ’ became separated it merged with the natural clan-gatherings at the ‘ goṣṭha,’ and led to the formation of the later ‘ goṣṭhī,’ whose functions were preeminently social and pleasurable.

---

[1] Hillebrandt: Ved. Myth., 2, 124, note 6.

[2] Vide infra.

[3] Vide V.I., II, 430—1.

[4] Av. III, 19, 1; IX, 7, 9; XV, 9, 2.3.

[5] Vide ante.

[6] Vide ante.

[7] Vide following notes. Cf. similar association in the modern vernacular phrase ' sabhā-samiti,' and its use in the sense of ' wider assemblies and smaller committees.' (So also the vernacular expression ' goṣṭhī-gotra ' affords a clue to the relation between these two parallel early institutions: ' gotra ' referring to the smaller unit of a family or ' kin,' and ' goṣṭhī ' to the whole tribe or clan; in Buddhist and Maurya periods, the ' goṣṭhī ' is specially associated with the ' gaṇa,' which was wider than the ' gotra.').

[8] Av. VII, 12, 1 (2 dtrs. of Prajāpati, etc.).

[9] Av. XII, 1, 56; cf. VII, 12, 1.

[10] Av. XII, 1, 56.

[11] Av. XV, 9, 2.3; (the context would show that the Av. regarded these institutions as originally derived from the ' Vrāty.' Kingship of Magadha).

[12] Av. VIII, 10, 5.6; cf. Ṛv. I, 91, 20, where a fit son is ' sadanya,' 'vidathya ' and ' sabheya ' in increasing order of eminence.

---

[1] So also in Mbh. II, 56—71, the same gathering (in the same hall) of gambling princes and others watching the game, is subsequently appealed to as a court of justice with its ' full bench.' But in the same period, at the Matsya capital the ' sabhā ' (where dice is played and a council of war is held) has an offshoot, the music-and dancing-hall.

[2] Vāja. Saṃ. XXX, 18; Taitt. Brā. III, 4, 16, 1.

[3] Taitt. Brā. III, 4, 16, 1.

[4] Taitt. Brā. III, 7, 4, 6.

[5] Taitt. Saṃ. II, 3, 1, 3; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XI, 4; Mait. Saṃ. II, 2, 1.

[6] Vide ante, note 1, page 4.

[7] Av. XIX, 55, 6 (' my sabhā '); Taitt. Saṃ. III, 4, 8, 6 (a man's ' sabhā '); Taitt. Brā. I, 1, 10, 3; probably Chānd. Upan. VIII, 14 (Prajāpati's abode and sabhā).

[8] Rv. II, 24, 13; I, 91, 20 (probable); Av, XX, 128, 1; Vāja. Saṃ. XXII, 22.

[9] Rv. IV, 2, 5.

[10] Rv. I, 167, 3. Cf. Rv. X, 85, 26.27 = Av. XIV, I, 20.21 (where the bride, either in advanced age, or earlier if she comes to control her home, is expected to ' speak unto the council ').

Associations of learned men called ‘ pariṣads ’ were in existence in the later Vedic period,[5] and the origin of this institution may well be referred to the earlier epoch[6]; at any rate these ‘ pariṣads ’ were early converted into administrative institutions (councils of judges and ministers), and it is very probable that the ‘ pariṣad ’ either held its sittings in the traditional ‘ sabhā,’[7] or came to possess a special habitation of its own. As the 'pariṣads' were mainly sittings around of 'ācāryas,' specialists in law and custom, sacred and secular, and as these 'ācāryas' had their 'kulas' which were commodious enough for resident students and their own families it would be quite natural for the sessions to have been held in some block of these 'kulas' ordinarily. These 'ācārya-kulas' were not[1] merely one or two wretched huts (like their declining and impoverished modern representatives, the 'ṭols'). It seems probable that youths of all the classes of society were required[2] to, and even girls optionally could,[3] reside for a certain period in 'brahmacarya,' though the period of such discipline may well have varied from class to class, and much of the course been optional or unnecessary for the non-brāhmaṇ and girl pupils.[4] These 'kulas' then must have been quite capacious and complex in plan.[5] A teacher might admit quite a number of pupils,[6] and Vedic as well as Epic-Purāṇic traditions refer to more or less specified numbers of resident students[7] in particular establishments. The ācārya' was to teach everything to at least those staying on with him for a year,[8] while many students would stay on in their teacher's house for twelve to thirty-two years, even after the Vedas were done.[9] Hence the teacher of the later Vedic period must have had in his 'kula' sufficient accommodation of a permanent nature to provide for such prolonged stays and no doubt also frequent migrations[10]: such provision must have been possible largely through the voluntary fees of sons of nobles and princes,[1] about which the Epic and other ancient traditions say a good deal. What the general plan of these 'kulas' were, we may gather from the terms 'ante-vāsin'[2] and 'ācārya-kula-vāsin'[3] used of the resident student: he dwelt near by, but in the outskirts as it were, yet it was all within the teacher's family home or establishment; i.e., the pupils' quarters were in separate blocks a little apart, which were still part of the same structural unit. We might discover in these 'ācārya-kulas' of the earlier epoch (residence in 'brahmacarya' being known as early as the Atharva-veda[4]) the same general plan which characterizes the later monastic establishments,[5] Buddhist or otherwise,—a quadrangular structure with cells on all sides and the shrine and abbot's cell in the centre of the quad, or with the cells on three sides and the East-facing block set apart for the abbot and the shrine. The 'pariṣads' of learned men, therefore (and the similar but mainly theological associations of the 'upaniṣads,' or sacred and 'secret' sessions to discuss the mysteries of theology), together with the 'ācārya-kulas' (of which they were probably special developments), may be looked upon as the later (or even early) Vedic beginnings, out of which the pre-Buddhistic and Buddhistic centres of learning of the 'residential university' type[6] were evolved.

---

[1] Rv. III, 23, 4; V, 3, 11; VII, 7, 5; Av. VIII, 10, 1-5; XIX, 55, 6. (This led to a metaphorical use of ‘ viśpati ’; so also, apparently, the priest prayed at the ‘ sabhā ’ altar while the King fought : V.I., II, 5).

[2] Vide note 1 above.

[3] Vide ante, n 2, p. 10; so also in the Epic, pillars are the main features of sabhās, while there are various adjuncts according to special needs and circumstances.

[4] For references for these several functions of the ‘ sabhā,’ vide V.I., II, 426-427.

[5] Temp. Bṛhad. Upan. Jaim. Upan. Brā. and Gobh. Gṛ. Sūt. ; vide details in VI., I, 497.

[6] This institution also was apparently originally of a pastoral character ; the ‘ pariṣad,’ rich in kine, is said to have been made by the ancient fathers (Āṅgirasas, etc.) for men : Av. XVIII, 3, 22; cf. Rv. IV, 2, 17.

[7] Which had its judicial side.

---

[1] Thus in Epic-Purāṇic tradition these are fully prosperous establishments, where princes are entertained sumptuously, and are quite comfortable places for them to be in residence for instruction.

[2] Re. probability of this system, vide V.I., II, 75.

[3] As the application of 'brahmacarya' to unmarried girls (who thus become fit for marriage) in the Av. shows, together with a number of actual cases known to Epic-Purāṇic tradition.

[4] Buddhist Burmah still retains a trace, in its system of education, of this ancient Indian theory and practice.

[5] The Epic-Purāṇic accounts always depict them as such; cf. the description in Mbh. Śakuntalop°.

[6] Taitt. Āraṇ. VII, 3; cf. Taitt. Upan. I, 4 (students flocking from all sides.).

[7] Cf. the quite reasonable numbers of residents said to have been killed in some ṛṣi āśramas by the Kālakeya raids of tradition. (That the Vāsiṣṭha teachers of an earlier period had full 'classes' is shown by the famous 'frog-hymn' in Rv.). In the Jātaka tradition the average number of students resident with renowned professors is 500.

[8] Śat. Brā. XIV, 1, 1. 26.27; cf. Ait. Āran. V, 3, 3.

[9] Chānd. Upan. IV, 10, 1; cf. III, 11, 5; Taitt. Upan. I, 11, 1; etc.

[10] For some left before completing a year, and migrations from teacher to teacher were frequent, specially in the cases of students who wanted solutions of special difficulties.

5828

So also we find the prototypes of the Buddhistic trunk-roads and travellers' rest houses in Vedic conditions. Road-making indeed proceeded side by side[7] with the Āryan settlement: with reference to the extension of settlements in the new land, the clearing of forests, and making of roads, gods like Agni and Pūṣan, and 'ṛṣis' (like the Roman 'pontifices') are called 'pathi-kṛt,' the path-makers.[8] The Vedic builders were not long content with forest-tracks or village-paths; for even in the Ṛgveda (and later Saṃhitās) we find the 'prapatha' or long journey by (broad) road,[9] and the Atharva-veda refers to the ‘ parirathyā ’ or road suitable for chariots.[1] ‘ Setu ’ is found from the Ṛg- and Yajur-vedas onwards,[2] but the precise sense does not come out clearly. It has been held that a causeway of an ordinary type, merely a raised bank for crossing inundated land is meant, and that its use is probably metaphorical in Vedic literature; but a metaphorical use of a term can hardly come into existence unless there has been previous simple use of it, and the sort of structure indicated here would be quite natural to and characteristic of the Gangetic delta, but can hardly be referred to the pre-eminently Vedic regions (or Madhyadeśa): besides, there is no inconsistency in ascribing to the ‘ setu ’ the sense of a causeway of some ‘ special ’ structure, a dam or a bridge (more of use in the Vedic regions proper), when we find long road-journeys performed and drives constructed.[3] Later on (in the Brāhmaṇas) villages are connected with ‘ mahāpathas ’ or high roads[4]; and causeways (‘ badvan ’) firmer than an ordinary road are known.[5] A much earlier reference, to well-made pleasant cart-roads, on a higher level than adjoining fields, forests and other village-tracks, with great trees planted beside, passing through villages or towns, and with occasional pairs of pillars (i.e., gateways, evidently near the approaches of some town), is made in the Av.,[6] where bridal processions pass through such routes. ‘ Prapatha ’ in the Yajur-veda has also the sense of a ‘ broad road ’[7]; while in Rv. itself ‘ prapathas ’ are also rest-houses, apparently on the ‘ prapatha ’ or high road, for the travellers, where ‘ khādi ’ or food may be obtained[8]; so also in the Av., where every ‘ tīrtha ’ along the bridal route is said to be well provided with drink, the

---

[1] Cf. the teacher's prayer in Taitt. Upan. I, 4, for material prosperity along with influx of large numbers of students.

[2] Vide n. 9, p. 12; also, Sat Brā. V, 1, 5, 17; Bṛhad. Upan. VI, 3, 7; Taitt. Upan. I, 3, 3; cf. Ait. Āraṇ. III, 2, 6; Śāṅkh. Āraṇ. VIII, 1, 1.

[3] Chānd. Upan. II, 23, 2 (settling long therein). Cf. note 4 below.

[4] 'Brahmacaryeṇa vas': Av. VII, 109, 7; Ait. Brā. V, 14; cf. Av. XI, 5 (*re* the 'student').

[5] E.g. as represented in the sculptures of the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C.

[6] Traces of whose elaborate structural arrangements are now being unearthed at the sites of Takṣa-śilā and Nālanda.

[7] If indeed roads were not there already; the cross-country roads feeding the ancient S.W. seaports, may have been much older than Āryan settlement. [The Sindh-Punjab excavations of 1924 seem to prove existence of such ports in the pre-Āryan India of the 3rd millennium B.C.]

[8] Vide refs. in VI., I, 489-490.

[9] Rv. X, 17, 4.6; 63, 16; (cf. Ait. Brā. VII, 15). Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXXVII, 14.

---

[1] Av. VIII, 8, 22. Whitney translates ‘ rim ’; but ‘ road ’ gives a better sense from the context, where a sacrifice is likened to a chariot journey. Cf. Av. XII, 1, 47 (many roads, for people to go upon, ‘ vartmans ’ for chariots, and for the going of the cart, by which men good or bad go about, free from enemies and robbers; v. 45 refers to many countries with people of different speech and customs).

[2] Rv. IX, 41, 2; Taitt. Saṃ. III, 2, 2, 1 : VI, 1, 4, 9; 5, 3, 3; VII, 5, 8, 5; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXVII, 4; Ait. Brā. III, 35; Taitt. Brā. II, 4, 2, 6 : Śat. Brā. XIII. 2, 10, 1; Bṛhad. Upon. IV, 4, 4; Chānd. Upan. VIII, 4, 1, 2; etc.

[3] Vide n. 8, p. 13, and n. 1 above.

[4] Ait. Brā. IV, 17, 8; Chānd. Upan. VIII, 6, 2; (this agrees fully with early Buddhist references to such roads; vide also n. 6 below).

[5] Pañc. Brā. I, 1. 4; cf. Lāṭ. Śr. Sūt. I, 1, 23.

[6] Av. XIV, 1, 63 and XIV. 2, 6. 7. 8. 9. 12. Such a road is ‘ ascended ’ from the village roads; it is possible that the ‘ pillar standing in the way ’ may refer to barrier posts, for the levying of toll or octroi on the trade routes.

[7] Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXXVII. 14.

[8] Rv. I. 166, 9 (Wilson; Trans. Rv. 2, 151). The reading ‘ prapadeṣu ’ is not necessary, as the connection between ‘ prapatha ’ the high road and ‘ prapatha ’ the rest-house is quite clear.

'tīrthas' are something like these 'prapathas' being rest-houses on the fords.[1] The Av., and some Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, mention the 'āvasatha,' which, though literally meaning dwelling, is not used in the general sense of abode till much later,[2] but which is used there in a special sense,[3] a structure of some sort for the reception of guests, specially of brāhmaṇs and others on the occasion of feasts and sacrifices; it may have been something like the later 'dharma-śālās' or guest- and rest-houses,—though not necessarily on the high road. Travelling indeed seems to have been quite common: dwelling abroad and residence in foreign countries is mentioned in the Rv. itself,[4] and the Av. has got its ceremonies for return from 'pravāsa' (along with the Gṛhya Sūtras),[5] and vividly describes the weary merchant's homecoming; while the Yv. Saṃhitās know of 'yāyāvaras'[6] or travelling mendicants, probably the predecessors of the itinerant monks of the 7th and 6th centuries B.C.. The appellation 'Prapathin' given to a Yādava prince in the Rv.[7] may probably indicate that princes of those times, like their successors a few centuries later, were already makers of long roads and philanthropic rest-houses.

Building-activities, indeed, developed in Vedic times not only through the needs of social and corporate life, as in the case of the 'goṣṭhī,' the 'vidatha,' the 'sabhā,' and the like, but also through the kings and lesser chieftains.[8] In speaking of ancient Indian polity it is still customary to call up a vision of a sole monarch towering above a dead level of agricultural population; but evidence for the Vedic and Buddhistic periods does not point to such Chaldaean simplicity. It rather appears that between the King and the common people there were intermediate ranks of a fighting nobility, analogous to the medieval knighthood of Europe or Rājput India. We must assume, for the Vedic (even Buddhistic) period, some such significance attaching to the well-known terms 'rājanya' and 'kṣatriya' (and other cognate words). Apart from this, it would appear that such a class is referred to in the 'ibhyas,' rich lords (in fact 'ibhya' later on[1] becomes a synonym for rich and noble), possessing retainers or elephants (privileges traditionally indicating lordliness),[2]—whom the King is said to devour as fire the forest.[3] That the 'ibhyas' were nobles is quite clear, but what 'ibha' means is not equally so: Pischel and Geldner follow Sāyaṇa and Mahīdhara's comments on the word in some passages in making it equivalent to elephants[4]; but though this meaning is common later on, it is not so as we go back; for the Nirukta gives both elephant and retainer as equally good meanings,[5] while the Aśokan inscriptions have it in the sense of 'vaiśya' or subordinate.[6] This latter use is significant for it shows that 'ibha' really had a special political or constitutional meaning. Hence, in the Ṛgvedic and Yajurvedic passages where it occurs,[7] it is better to take it in the sense of retainers and vassals, with Roth, Ludwig and Zimmer[8]; this entourage[9] may well have included, besides servants and dependents, members of the 'ibhya's' own family, and young cadets from subordinate families of chieftains (specially in the case of princes).[10] The existence of such lords is indicated also by the use of 'veśa' in all the

---

[1] Av. XIV, 2, 6.

[2] E.g. Ait. Upan. III, 12.

[3] Av. IX, 6, 5 (entertaining brāhmaṇs); Taitt. Brā. I, 1, 10, 6; III, 7, 4, 6; Śat. Brā. XII, 4, 4, 6; Chānd. Upan. IV, 1, 1; details in the Sūtras: Āpast. Śr. Sūt. V. 9, 3; Āpast. Dh. Sūt. II, 9, 25, 4.

[4] Rv. VIII, 29, 8.

[5] Av. VII, 60, 1-6; cf. Āśval. Gṛh. Sūt. 1, 15; Śāṅkh. Gṛh. Sūt. II, 17; etc.

[6] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 2, 1, 7; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XIX, 12. (The Epic tradition also assigns 'yāyāvara' sects, to which Jarat-Kāru belonged, to the period immediately after the close of the Ṛgvedic).

[7] Rv. VIII, 1, 30 (the prince lauded for his superior weapons, horses and 'prapathas'). It is noteworthy that the name is given to a 'Yādava' prince, Asaṅga, who may be placed at the close of the Ṛgvedic period (being apparently the same as Asaṅga, the son or grandson of Satrājit and a near relative of Kṛṣṇa); tradition ascribes (cf. Mbh., Hariv. & Br.) much building activity in S.W. India to the Yādavas of the Ṛgvedic period, and all that is known of ancient commercial activities, points to the early development of communications in those regions.

[8] It would be most unusual, if they were not so developed. (Even the petty Pāñcāla and other princes lauded in the Rv. were evidently opulent, and there were greater and more famous kings than these).

---

[1] Chānd. Upan. I, 10, 1, 2; etc. (Vide V. I., p. 80, for other refs.). Even here the sense may be 'grāma' belonging to an 'ibhya' or nobleman, and hence 'having retainers and elephants,' *i.e.*, 'rich.'

[2] The Greek writers noted this for India of their time; cf. the epic story of King Dhṛtarāṣṭra of the Kurus remonstrating with a brāhmaṇa for possessing an elephant.

[3] Rv. I, 65, 4. (This relationship is a commonplace in 'Rājadharma' tradition).

[4] Sāy.° and Mahi.° on Taitt. Saṃ. I. 2, 14, 1 and Vāja. Saṃ. XIII, 9; with Pischel and Geldner: Ved. Stud. I, xv—xvi.

[5] Nir. VI, 12.

[6] Cf. Bühler: Z.D.M.G., 37, 279, on Edict. No. 5.

[7] Rv. I, 84, 17; IV, 4. 1; IX. 57, 3; VI, 20. 8 (the Vedic proper name or title 'Smad-ibha' or Great Bran), Taitt. Saṃ. 1, 2, 14, 1; Vāja. Saṃ. XIII, 9.

[8] Roth: Dict., s.v.; Ludwig: Trans. Rv. 3, 246—7; Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 167.

[9] Cf. the 'upasti' (comp. to the epic 'upasthā' and medieval 'kāyastha') or dependents, clients proper of the King, not servile, but specially related, as opposed to ordinary subjects, including conquered tribal chiefs, ambitious men (like Sūtas and Grāmaṇīs) and state officials. For references, vide V.I., 1, 96.

[10] Cf. young princes of petty states in the entourage of the bigger King Javadratha, who serve him as standard-bearers, messengers, etc.,—in Mbh.

Saṃhitās[1] in the sense of vassal tenant or dependent neighbour: Geldner[2] is content with the meaning of a neighbour or member of the same village community; but this view is not tenable, as 'veśya' in Rv.[3] is used definitely in the sense of dependence, and 'vaiśya' in Taitt. Saṃ. plainly means servitude[4] (besides other derivatives[5] used in the Saṃhitās with similar significance); again, the sense of neighbour belongs not to 'veśa' by itself but to 'prati-veśa,'[6] (also used in the Saṃhitās), literally 'fellow-vassal,' hence a neighbour, the earlier word for it being 'nahuṣ,' of Indo-germanic origin. That vassalhood to a lord was not uncommon is indicated by expressions (in the Atharva-veda and some Brāhmaṇas) like 'nātha-kāma' or 'nātha-vid,'[7] referring to men seeking the protection of lords, probably much as the protection of Anglo-Saxon earls and Norman barons was sought by the ordinary freeholder or cultivator.[8]

Now it follows from all this, that from the early Vedic times onwards there existed something like a feudal military baronage, connected with kings on the one hand and dependent vassals on the other, wealthy enough to excite the cupidity of the former and enjoy princely prerogatives, and powerful enough to protect the vassals who sought them. All this however would be impossible without something like baronial strongholds or other similar specialized structure. Evidently these are to be found in some at least of the Vedic 'purs.' According to this view the invocation of the king (in the Rājasūya) as 'purāṃ bhettā'[9] gains appreciably in significance: an anti-baronial king fighting for suzerainty and order would certainly be better fitted for such eulogy than a simple 'breaker or sacker of cities,' which would be more to Assyrian taste. So also this view gives a better meaning to 'pur-pati' (of the Rv.)[10] than that of a 'a regular official, like "grāmaṇī," in charge of a permanently fortified settlement,' or 'a temporary commander of a temporary fort or garrison' (which latter is held to be more probable),[1]—viz., 'lord of a castle,' an 'ibhya' or 'nātha.' Such a view is further supported by the fact that some of the 'purs' had names ascribed to them, such as Paṭharu,[2] Ūrjayantī,[3] or Nārminī,[4] while some of these names were derived from those of chieftains possessing them, e.g. from Narmin(a),[5] or Śambara (his forts being called 'Śambaras' in neuter plural).[6]

---

[1] Rv. IV, 3, 13; V, 85, 7; X, 49. 5 (prob.); Vāj. Sam. (Kāṇ); II, 5, 7; Mait. Sam. I, 4, 8; II, 3, 7; IV, 1, 13; AV. II, 32, 5; vide also notes 3—6 below.

[2] Geldner: Ved. Stud. 3, 135, note 4.

[3] Rv. IV, 26, 3; VI, 61. 14.

[4] Taitt. Saṃ. II, 3, 7, 1.

[5] 'Veśas' and 'pariveśas' in the sense of chief and subordinate tenants of the King, as opposed to 'Kṣullakas' or petty proprietors, in Av. II, 32, 5; 'veśatva' in Kāṭh. Saṃ. XII, 5. (Cf. St. Pet. Dict., s.v. 'veśa' and 'veśatva').

[6] Rv. X, 66, 13; Taitt. Saṃ. II, 6, 97; Vāj. Saṃ. XI, 75; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXXVI. 9; Sat. Brā. IV, 1, 5, 2; Taitt. Upan. I, 4, 3.

[7] Av. XIII, 2, 37; XI, 1. 15; (cf. Pañc. Brā. XIV, 11, 23); Av. IV, 20, 9; IX, 2, 17; XVIII. 1, 13; Taitt. Brā. I, 6, 4, 1.

[8] Cf. the Epic case of a robbed cattle-owner approaching Arjuna for protection; and the epic maxim that first a 'rājan' is to be selected or chosen, then a home may be established,—where 'rājan' is rather such a baron than the 'great king.'

[9] Vide V.I., II. 219, for refs. to 'rāja-sūya' passages.

[10] Rv. I. 173, 10; (cf. Ludwig: Trans. Rv. 3, 204; and V.I., II, 13-14.)

'Purs' were owned as often by the chiefs of the earlier population as by the new-coming Vedic Āryans; Pipru of the 'black brood' possessed many forts,[7] and we hear of the castles of Cumuri, Dhuni and others, in all probability Dāsa chiefs[8]; while to Śambara the Dāsa hero are ascribed 90, 99 or 100 'purs.'[9] The real existence of the Dāsas as a distinct people[10] in the Ṛgvedic times seems to be beyond doubt. The Dāsas have their 'viśaḥ,' and are classed as a 'varṇa'[11]; they were often dwellers in the mountainous regions[12]; they had great wealth themselves,[13] and wealthy Āryan chiefs were those who had 'dāsa-pravarga rayiḥ' or wealth consisting of troops of 'dāsa' slaves[14]; and the women of the Dāsas are found as slave-girls and concubines.[15] It is thus quite unnecessary to take Pipru, Śambara and others as other than real aboriginal but civilized Dāsa chieftains, whom the Vedic immigrants had found it not easy to dislodge from their numerous strongholds in the country. As however they were being ousted step by step, their forts would naturally pass into Āryan hands, and become Āryan baronial strongholds, whence the 'nāthas'' and 'pur-patis' might protect the 'veśas.' Sometimes 'purs' may have formed parts of the 'grāmas' themselves[16]; in these cases a whole clan or band of Āryans instead of mighty chiefs may have overpowered and entered into possession of some minor Dāsa stronghold, and then made it the basis of their ‘grāma’ settlement. On the whole the view of Zimmer, and others after him,[1] that Vedic India knew of nothing more solid and complex than the hamlet, like the early Germans and Slavs who had no castle-structures and town-life, is an extreme one; for it is now being realized more and more as a basic fact that the Vedic Indians, like the Irāṇians, Hellenes and Italians, were superimposed upon an earlier civilization,[2] in all probability of the same type (and maybe of cognate origins) as in the other three cases, and were similarly affected as regards religion, arts and crafts.[3] The Germanic parallels therefore should not be carried too far.[4] Thus it becomes quite reasonable to find in ‘pṛthvī,’[5] ‘urvī,’[5] ‘śatabhuji,’[6] ‘aśmamayī,’[7] or ‘āyasī’[8] ‘purs,’ or the massive, extensive, hundred-walled, stone-built, or iron-protected forts, vivid descriptions of new and wonderful things the Vedic heroes actually saw; and the rather forced explanations discovering in them mysteries of myths and fancies of metaphor become unnecessary. The main difference, originally, between the Dāsa and the Āryan ‘purs’ must have lain in the materials used (which depended on the nature of the country they were familiar with), large sections of the former being acquainted with the Vindhyān and Central Indian granites[9] and metal ores,[10] the latter with timber-work mainly. But adaptations from one another seem to have occurred quite early: Suṣṇa, apparently a Dāsa enemy, used ‘pur cariṣṇu,’ or small

---

[1] The rarity of the word does not necessarily prove the temporary character of the command; it is equally accounted for by the fact that naturally the ṛṣis would be less familiar with the 'pur-pati' than with the 'grāmaṇi).

[2] Rv. I, 112, 7 (Luwdig : Trans. Rv. 3, 304). (Sāyana takes it as a man's name).

[3] Belonging to Nārmara, a prince (Ludwig) or a demon (Roth: St. Pet. Dict. s.v.); Rv. II, 13, 8 (Ludwig : Trans. Rv. 3, 152).

[4] Rv. I, 149, 3 (Ludwig : Trans. Rv., 3, 204).

[5] Vide n. 4 above, and St. Pet Dict. s.v.; (Oldenberg : Rv.-noten, I, 148; SBE. 46, 177).

[6] V.I., II, 355.

[7] Rv. I, 51, 5; VI, 20, 7.

[8] Rv. VI, 18, 8 (cf. VI, 20, 13; 26, 6; IV, 30, 21; II, 13, 9; X, 113, 9; II, 15, 9; VII, 19, 4).

[9] Rv. I, 130, 7; II, 19, 6; II, 14, 6; II, 24, 2.

[10] *Re* Sambara as a real Dāsa, cf. Rv. 1, 130, 7; IV, 30, 14; VI, 26, 5.

[11] For references vide V.I., I, 356-358.

[12] Rv. II, 12, 11; IV, 30, 14; VI, 26, 5.

[13] Rv. I, 176, 4; IV, 30, 13; VIII, 40, 6; X, 69, 5; Av. VII, 90, 2.

[14] Rv. I, 92, 8; cf. I, 158, 5 (Geldner : Rv.-glossar : 82).

[15] Vide other notes *re* 'dāsi.'

[16] As conjectured by Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 142, 148 (cf. 'grāma-durga's in Purāṇic tradition).

[1] Summarized in V.I., I, 538—540.

[2] [Extensive remains of this earlier Indian civilisation (cir. 3,000 to 2,000 B.C.) have very recently been discovered in the Punjab and Sindh. Many of the suggestions and inferences in this work, based upon literary evidence chiefly, will be found to be remarkably corroborated by these archæological discoveries. These also make it almost certain that the W. Asiatic or Minoan civilisations had much in common with this earliest Indian civilisation which was their source both racially and culturally. This field of investigation promises to be most fruitful for Purāṇic scholars and epigraphists.]

[3] Thus it is demonstrable from traditional accounts that Vedic Brāhmanism itself was originally non-Āryan (cf. Pargiter: AIHT).

[4] There is really very little of common conditions.

[5] Rv. I, 189, 2.

[6] Rv. I, 166, 8; VII, 15, 14.

[7] Rv. IV, 30, 20.

[8] Rv. I, 58, 8; II, 10, 18; 20, 8; IV, 27, 1; VII, 3, 7; 15, 4; 95, 1; X, 101, 8 (cf. Muir. Sans. T. 22, 378ff.).

[9] Cf. n. 12, p. 18; (the hill-tracts referred to would appear to be mainly Vindhyān, if the traditions regarding the distribution of pre-Aila races are taken along with it; so also according to these traditions the Ailas came through North Himālayān regions into the plains just below, an area still famous for timber art and architecture).

[10] Iron and copper smelting by using surface-coal is almost a prehistoric achievement of the Drāvido-Kolārian races of N.-E. Deccān.

moveable forts,[1] evidently constructed of timber ; it could only have been either erected on trucks with four or more wheels[2] to be drawn by horses or elephants, or composed of adjusted parts easily dismantled or put together, a sort of 'camp-tower '[3]; so also the Āryans had their 'pāṣya' or stone-bulwarks,[4] but the use of this word to denote also the stone slabs for pressing 'soma,'[5] shows that such defences were a later acquisition. 'Dehī,' a defensive construction of some sort,[6] is used specially of non-Āryan defences, though not invariably; it might mean either hasty defences thrown up against an enemy, or more permanent earthworks and dykes, or rubble rampart and trench going together,—which last is the most suitable sense. It is likely that these 'dehīs' are the 'śāradī'[7] or 'autumnal' forts ascribed apparently to the Dāsas[8]; these may have been more or less temporary earthworks, ramparts or trenches, constructed every autumn to meet fresh campaigns of the Āryans[9]; but in the course of time 'dehīs' found to be of strategical service would come to be permanently used.[10]

---

[1] Rv. VIII, 1, 2—8 (cf. Hillebrandt : Ved. Myth. 1, 300 n. ; 3, 289 n.).

[2] Like the later 'rathas,' e.g. as represented at Koṇārak. Cf. temporary residences, like 'rathas,' built for kings in Rājasūya sacrificial area,—in Mbh.

[3] The construction may have been suggested by the 'ratha-vāhanas' in common use in the Vedic age, which were moveable stands for chariots, probably drawn by horses ('ratha-vāhana-vāhas') into the battle-field, where the chariots were then used in action. With this may be compared the many-wheeled stands used in the same way even in the present day for the 'divine' 'rathas'; these 'rathas' on stands indicate what the 'pur cariṣṇu' must have been like. This makes it probable that the references to more than 4 wheels for a chariot are not mythical in every case. Thus something like a many-wheeled 'pur cariṣṇu' seems to have been thought of in Av. X, 2, 28ff, where the 'pur' of 'Brahman' is described as 8-wheeled and 9-doored. For 'ratha-vāhana,' vide :—Rv. VI, 75, 8; Av. III, 17, 3; Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 2, 5. 5=Kāṭh. Saṃ. XVI, 11=Mait. Saṃ. II, 7, 12=Vāś. Dh. Sūt. II, 34, 35. Cf. also, Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXI, 10; Taitt. Brā. I, 7. 9, 6; Śat Brā. V, 4, 3, 23ff. For 'ratha-vāhana-vāha,' vide :—Taitt. Saṃ. I, 8, 20, 1; Taitt. Brā. I, 8. 4, 3; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XV, 9; Mait. Saṃ. II, 2, 1.

[4] Rv. I, 56, 6.

[5] Rv. IX, 102, 2 Macdonell : J.R.A.S. 1893, 457—458).

[6] Rv. VI, 47, 2; VII, 6, 5 (cf. Schrader : Preh. Ant. 344; Zimmer : Alt. Leb. 143).

[7] Rv. I, 131, 4; 174, 2; VI, 20, 10.

[8] Rv. I, 103, 3; III, 12, 6; IV, 32, 10.

[9] It may be possible to connect 'dehī' with 'dih,' to smear or plaster, and thus to take it as a mud wall; but it is noteworthy that 'd(ḍ)ihi' 'd(ḍ)ih,' 'dah' or 'dā,' are quite common-place names in Bengal, Bihār and Choṭānāgpur (regions where indigenous non-Āryan elements are often clearly traceable), have a similar implication of trench and ramparts, or a defensible area of high rugged ground (cf. the E. vern. expr. 'dah paḍā,' to get a wound like 'ditch and wall'). Probably the ancient place-name 'Vi-deha (°gha)' is to be traced from a 'dehī' fort; cf. 'śālā' in 'Vi-śāla,' 'Vai-śālī' or 'Vi-śālā,' in the same region.

[10] Thus giving rise to place-names with 'dehī' or its cognate words (and possibly even with 'pur').

Autumn indeed has always been the traditional season for military ventures in India, when the rains cease and the country becomes fit for marches, and the tradition probably goes back to pre-Āryan experience; it is difficult to see the point of the usual explanation[1] that these structures were intended to afford shelter from the 'autumnal inundations' and were therefore of the nature of dykes.[2] On the other hand the 'purs' which might, like fort Paṭharu, be saved by rain-storms from being set on fire,[3] or in the siege of which fire was used,[4] or again, which were full of kine ('gomatī'),[5] were evidently timber-built and characteristically Āryan.[6] The Vedic 'gomatī purs' are the prototypes (or paratypes) of the Epic 'go-gṛhas,' or fortified, extensive, cowstalls, the scenes of many knightly ventures,—and possibly the 'go-puras' of later architecture[7] are to be traced to this origin. The 'gomatī purs' must have originally been protected merely by earthen ramparts, with timber palisade and ditch. In some cases the palisade of an Āryan 'pur' may have been only a hedge of thorn or a row of stakes[8] fixed vertically and horizontally,[9] serving to make the approach difficult for enemies: the Ṛgvedic 'durga'[10] may have primarily meant some such 'pur,' with thorn-hedge, stakes and ditches as hindrances to approach, but the meaning of a regular fort or stronghold may suit the passages equally well.[11] 'Vapra,' so frequent later on, occurs in the Av. in the sense of rampart,[12] but the reading is somewhat doubtful; while the equally familiar 'prākāra' occurs only in the Sūtras,[1] and is used to denote a walled mound supporting either a platform and gallery for spectators, or a palace ('prāsāda')·

---

[1] E.g. in V.I.

[2] For, firstly, no floods usually occur in the autumn; secondly, these floods are not formidable in Madhyadeśa.

[3] Rv. I, 112, 7.

[4] Rv. VII, 5, 3.

[5] Av. VIII, 6, 23.

[6] Cf. the Epic (Bharatan) 'go-gṛhas,' and the arrangements for the cattle of the Bharata clan (in Ait. Brā.; vide ante.).

[7] The association of the 'divine bull' with later 'go-puras' may not be accidental.

[8] Cf. Rv. X, 101, 8 (Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 143-145); also Rv. VIII, 53, 5 (Roth: Z. D. M. G., 48, 109).

[9] This earlier fencing is represented in the later 'śāla-protected' cities known to the Upaniṣads, and in the massive Mauryan timber-palisades and stone railings.

[10] Rv. V, 34, 7; VII, 25, 2.

[11] In Rv. X, 85, 32=Av. XIV, 1, 64, 'durga' (difficult of approach and reached or passed by 'suga' ways) is used in a manner that indicates acquaintance with campaigns amidst hill-forts. Ancient place-names with 'durga' ('durg' or 'drug') are found chiefly in Central India and S. W. Deccān, and these are of strong rock-fortresses; this might throw some light on the type of forts meant by the Vedic 'durga.' Probably the epithets 'durgaha' (unapproachable) and 'girikṣit' (rock-render or rock-dweller) given to Māndhātṛ or other princes of his line) refer to such forts, sp. as acc. to Pur. tradition, Purukutsa and his brothers etc., are connected with Deccān expeditions, and Māndhātṛ also came into close contact with the S. W. Yādavas etc. (cf. also the Ikṣvāku kingdom in the Narmadā region, and the place-name Māndhātā'=anc. Māhiṣmatī).

[12] Av. VII, 71, 1 (Whitney: Trans. Av. 435-436).

'Pur' and 'pura' in Vedic literature are probably not identical, as they are usually taken to be. 'Pura' in 'tripura'[2] and 'mahāpura,[3] occurring in the Yv. Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas, is evidently something much bigger: the reference is to cities with three 'purs' or three rows of fortifications and to great fortified cities, rather than to an ordinary 'pur' or fort with three concentric walls, and to a big fort only.[4] This form 'pura,' again, occurs from the time of the Yv. onwards, when capital cities like Kāmpīla, had become familiar to brāhmaṇs; it is probable, however, that we have this form earlier still in the Rv., in the proper names 'Puraṃdhi' and 'Puraya,'[5] which, like the name 'Nagarin' in the Brāhmaṇas,[6] may indirectly point to the existence of such 'puras' or cities[7] in the earlier period. On the ground of the late occurrence of 'nagara' it has been held that city-life was not developed in Vedic period, and that possibly there were no towns.[1] But 'nagara,' city, occurs definitely in an Āraṇyaka,[2] which means a good deal, as it implies that the fame of the 'nagara' was wide and longstanding enough to have awakened interest even among the brāhmaṇs in the 'araṇyas'[3]; then again, it is quite clear from the occurrence of 'Nagarin,'[4] resident of a 'nagara' or capital city, as a proper name, and of 'Kauśāmbeya' (native of Kauśāmbī city) as an epithet,[5] that cities were in existence in the earlier Brāhmaṇa period. But at this point we lose sight of the 'nagara.' At the same time, from the Brāhmaṇas backwards up to the Yv. Saṃhitās, we find a substitute, the 'pura,'[6] while we also get well-known names of cities for the period.[7] Going further back, the city is no longer to be distinguished as such, but still there is the 'pur,' 'durga,' and other cognate settlements involving many different structural types and grades. The inevitable conclusion is that the 'pur' is the prototype,[8] the 'pura' is the developed city, and the 'nagara' is the full-fledged capital city. It is to be noted that the sense of any ordinary town for 'nagara' is quite a modern one; even in classical literature 'nagara' always stands for the imperial capital, at any rate one claiming such status or traditions. This makes it quite probable that the first occurrence of 'nagara' in the Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka age does not mean the first coming into existence of towns, but simply marks a stage in the history of Indian cities[9] and of the struggle for overlordship among the principalities and peoples of Northern India following Vedic settlement, the principal 'pura' of the paramount tribe or state being designated 'nagara,' like 'naga' or rocks,[10] by way of pre-eminence in strength, or probably by way of reference to its stone walls or towers. The references in the Upaniṣads to 11- or 9-gated citadels[1] thus reveals a new appropriateness, in the comparison of the proud and striving 'bodies' of the individual and of the corporate tribe; it becomes unnecessary to see in such 'puras' mere forts, and then to hold that 9 or 11 gateways are fanciful, their number depending on the nature of the body which is compared[2]; no doubt only one gate in a city is mentioned in a Brāhmaṇa,[3] but a comparison with 9- or 11-gated cities could hardly have occurred to people who had never seen more than one gate to a city; they may not have seen precisely 9 or 11 gates, but any other number, say 8 or 12, which is more probable,[4] as the earliest references to town plans, e.g., in the Mānasāra, Megasthenes, or actual remains,—while they are all subsequent to the period in question,—all point to the number of gateways being 4, 8, or multiples of 4 even up to 64.[5]

---

[1] Sāṅkh. Sr. Sūt. XVI, 18, 14. (These stages may however only indicate the gradually growing familiarity of brāhmaṇs as a whole with a pre-existent court and city life;—which was clearly a late Vedic feature).

[2] Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 2, 3; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXIV, 10; etc. Śat. Brā. VI, 3, 3, 25; Ait. Brā. II, 11; Kauṣ. Brā. (in Ind. Stud. 2, 310).

[3] Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 2, 3, 1; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXIV, 10; Mait. Saṃ. III, 8, 1; Ait. Brā. I, 23, 2; Gop. Brā. II, 2, 7.

[4] 'Tripura' is actually the name of a N. W. Deccān city in Pur. tradition; so is 'Ṣaṭpura' in the same region: both connected with much fighting and romantic tales regarding the Yādavas and their hostile neighbours, (cf. 'Daśa-pura,' also in the same region.).

[5] Rv. I, 116. 13; VI, 63, 9; ('puraṃdhi' occurs in other senses in Av. XIV, 50; Rv. I, 134, 3; Taitt. Saṃ. VII, 5, 18; etc.; vide infra.).

[6] Ait. Brā. V, 30; Jaim. Upan. Brā. III, 40, 2.

[7] 'Puraṃdhi' is explained by Sāyaṇa, as 'of great dhī'(!), and he takes 'vadhrimatī' as a proper name (which is unlikely); as a princess is referred to, 'pura' in 'puraṃdhi' may appropriately be taken to mean 'city'; so also with 'pura' in 'puraya,' the name of a king (who gives away horses, slaves, cars, and 'pakva,' or brick-built houses). Proper names with 'pura' are not uncommon in the Pur. dynastic lists. For the form 'puraṃdhi,' cf. the later 'puraṃdhrī.' 'Puraṃdhi' seems to have meant "residing within a 'pura' or fortified capital," i.e. a noblewoman or princess, such as 'Vadhrimatī' was; for this sort of designation cf. 'Subhadrā Kāmpīlavāsinī' of Yv. and 'Subhadrā Dvārakāvāsinī' of the Epic. Keith translates 'puraṃdhi' in Taitt. Saṃ. VII, 5, 18, by 'prolific woman'; but as the prayer there is for 'this kingdom,' where the birth of a prince, an archer, a hero, a 'rathī' and a 'sabheya' youth, is also desired,—'puraṃdhi' in this group must correspond to 'sabheya' and mean what was later called 'nāgarikā'; cf. Rv. I, 134, 3, where a 'puraṃdhi' maiden is awakened at night by her lover's visit. In the Av. (XIV, 1. 50) where a 'Puramdhi' is invoked in the marriage rites, the sense of 'prolific woman' might suit, but it is more probable that it means there the guardian female deity of the 'pura,' and as such (like Jarā-devī of the Magadhan capital in the Epic) a fertility goddess.

---

[1] Vide V.I., I, 538-540.

[2] Taitt. Āraṇ. I, 11, 18; 31, 4.

[3] Cf. the brāhmaṇical notice of Ayodhyā as a 'grāma.'

[4] Vide ante.

[5] Śat. Brā. XII, 2, 2, 13; Gop. Brā. I, 2, 24.

[6] Vide ante.

[7] E.g. Kāmpila, Āsandīvant; Varaṇāvatī (Av. IV, 7, 1), or Kauśāmbi above.

[8] Also a wider class; 'purs' existed in the time of Brā.s and Upan.s also; e.g. Taitt. Brā. I, 7, 7, 5; Ait. Brā. I, 23; II, 11; Śat. Brā. III, 4, 4, 3; VI, 3, 3, 25; XI, 1, 1, 2-3; Chānd. Upan. VIII, 5, 3; etc.

[9] Compare the account given in Mārk. Pur. (xlix, 41ff.) of the development of civilization. Here the 'pura' (big fortified town) is regarded as succeeding 'fortresses' in time, and preceding the royal capital 'nagara.'

[10] Capital cities and royal castles (e.g. descr. of Indraprastha) are always compared to rocks and peaks in the Epic.

The capital city, 'pura' or 'nagara' must have belonged to some king or ruling family; and we should expect to find ample references to the special edifices connected with them; but such allusions are rather general and meagre, until we come to the close of the Vedic period. It is not that court and city life did not exist in the Vedic age, while it did in the Epic; it is rather a superficial appearance due to the fact that the Rv. and other priestly literature had much less to do with court life[6] than the epics and the Kṣatriya traditions had; thus when we come to special sections of the Yv. Saṃhitās,[7] which have some bearing on things regal, some more details do come forth. The Rv. knows of such a thing as a King's palace, and Varuṇa has one.[8] The 'harmya,' primarily denoting[9] the Vedic house as a unity, including stables, etc.,[10] very soon added on the qualification of being protected by a palisade or wall[1]; and in the Rv. itself we find a 'harmyeṣṭhaḥ' prince standing probably on the roof, or rather the balcony, of his palace,[2] just as any later Indian king would do to please his people. When the Av. thinks of a residence for Yama, it is a 'harmya.'[3] The specialized structure of 'prāsāda' is however, explicitly referred to rather late in the post-Vedic literature.[4] But it is clearly indicated in the earlier occurrence of 'ekaveśman,'[5] the towering prominent abode of the king as contrasted with the numerous houses of the people.

---

[1] Kāṭh. Upan. V, 1 (11); Śvetāś. Upan. III, 18 (9); (cf. Schrader: Preh. Ant. 412; Muir: Sans. T. 5, 451; Weber: Ind. Stud. I, 229; Ludwig: Trans. Rv. 3, 203).

[2] Keith: Ait. Āraṇ. 185.

[3] Śat. Brā. XI, 1, 1, 2, 3.

[4] The point of the comparison lies in the odd numbers 9 and 11,—for the real 'puras' had gates of even number,—i.e. 4 or multiples of 4.

[5] Which was the number for Pāṭaliputra; 4 gates were a corollary to the very ancient Indian plan, of cross-roads running in cardinal directions: and this would be the minimum, which could be embellished in multiples.

[6] The only occasions of contact being bestowal of gifts, and even that contact was not with the greater kings known to tradition, but mostly with petty local chieftains. It is to be noted that as soon as Vedic priests come into intimate contact with flourishing Kuru-Pāñcāla courts,—subsequently,—they mention Kāmpīla and Āsandīvant and various other court details (vide infra).

[7] E.g. in connection with the Rājasūya; vide infra.

[8] Rv. II, 41, 5; VII, 88, 5.

[9] Probably 'harmya' denotes a big man's establishment from the beginning. Cf. its association with the stabling, fences or walls, and 'viśaḥ' who are its inmates (Rv. I, 121, 1).

[10] Rv. I, 166, 4; IX, 71, 4; 78, 3; X, 43, 3; 73, 10; etc.; stabling etc.,—Rv. VII, 56, 16; cf X, 106, 5.

A quadrangular style of palace-structure (comparable with the old town-plan of 4 roads and gateways or multiples of them) is known as a main primary type in the Purāṇas (which appear to have got their technical information in common with the 'Silpa-śāstras' from some earlier special treatise, and whose compilers, the Sūtas, were also specialist builders to kings),[6]—and this is termed 'vairāja.'[7] It is perhaps pertinent to see in 'vairāja' a reference to the sort of 'harmyas' or residences the early Vedic chiefs raised for themselves on attainment of 'vairājya' or paramountcy of some sort; 'virāj' is a royal title in the Rv. and Av.,[8] and is well recognized in Purāṇic tradition; but in Ait. Brā. it is said at that time to have been used in Uttara-Kuru and Uttara-Madra only[9]; hence, either the 'vairāja' type of palace-construction (known to the Purāṇas) was introduced into Indian Midlands (in the 8th century B.C.) from these Himālayān regions (whence the model form of Sanskrit speech also was derived in that age), or the style

---

[1] Rv. VII, 55, 6.

[2] Rv. VII, 56, 16 (Geldner: Ved. Stud. 2, 278, n. 2; Alt. Leb. 149).

[3] Av. XVIII, 4, 55.

[4] Adbhūta Brā., in Ind. Stud. 1, 40; cf. 'prākāra,' and 'prāsāda' rising on it: Śāṅkh. Śr. Sūt. XVI, 18, 14.

[5] Śat. Brā., I, 3, 2, 14.

[6] Thus the chief architect to Janamejaya III (the Great) was a Paurānika Sūta (Mbh.). It probably indicates that palace architecture and fortifications were pre-eminently a Magadhan development.

[7] Gar. Pur. XLVII, 19ff. (*re* palaces).

[8] For refs. vide V.I., II, 304.

Ait. Brā. VIII, 14, 3; this particular seems to be historically significant, as in the time of the Ait. Brā. (vide Pargiter: AIHT, 326, etc.) the (Southern) Kurus and Madras had ceased to exist as kingdoms, the former uniting with the Pāñcālas and ever retreating eastwards, the latter being lost altogether; the Kuru-Pāñcāla Kings used the simple title of 'rāja,' as compared with the Eastern rulers, showing that they had decayed considerably was a more ancient one, continued even after the passing away of ' virāṭ '-ships of the early Vedic and Epic period.

Some details regarding the Vedic Kings' palace occur incidentally in connection with the court ceremonial of Rājasūya.[1] During this the ' ratna-havis ' rite was performed at the houses of the King's ' Ratnins,'—something like a cabinet of King's Friends, including the chief Queen and the Household Officers.[2] These Ratnins' houses must have been round about or adjacent to the King's palace,[3] being in the same royal and sacrificial area ; and the separate houses of the sacrificing King's ' mahiṣī,' ' vāvātā,' and ' parivṛktī,' indicate the existence of a complex palace of the harem type. It is noteworthy that both these particulars are borne out by the details of the Mahābhāratan court, traditionally assigned to about the same period as the compilation of the Yv. Saṃhitās.[4] Of the different offices a ' Kṣattṛ ' at the royal court might fill,[5] the Śatapatha names that of ' antaḥpurādhyakṣa ' or ' harem-superintendent ' (which might be polished into ' chamberlain '), thus implying a full-fledged palace establishment. This is also indicated by the other alternative functions of the Kṣattṛ, who might be the ' gate-keeper ' (of the palace), with assistants called ' anukṣattṛ,'[6] or the ' distributor of the King's gifts, etc. ' Here also the epic accounts agree as to the functions of the Kṣattṛ, and the elaborate court-life implied.[7] Thus it may reasonably be concluded that what is hinted at in the meagre references of the priestly texts is only given in full in the Epic, quite naturally. It is also noteworthy that chiefly those details *re* royal establishments are given in the former, with which a sacrificial priesthood would be most

---

[1] Taitt. Saṃ. I, 8, 9, 1ff; Taitt. Brā. I, 7, 31ff; Śat. Brā. V, 3, 1, 1ff.—Mait. Saṃ. II, 6, 5; IV, 3, 8; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XV, 4.

[2] This group of King's Ratnas is practically the same in Kṣatriya tradition also. Cf. Vāyu. 57, 70.

[3] The plan is fully traditional; so also in Mughal imperial seats, where many early Hindu plans and symbolisms were adapted (vide Havell), the houses of the chief advisers and nobles were blocks in the same palace area, along with the separate establishments of the chief queens and princesses.

[4] Vide Pargiter: AIHT, pp. 318, '20, '21, '23, '24, etc.

[5] Vide details of refs. in V.I. I. 201 ; the function of ' disburser,' in Rv., Av., etc. ; that of ' gate-keeper,' in Yv. and early Brā.s.

[6] Vāja Sam. XXX, 11 ; 13.

[7] Cf. the case of Vidura, who filled the first and the last offices at the Kuru and Pāṇḍava courts from time to time.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preseyation Foundation, Chandigarh

acquainted; thus, again, Janamejaya-Pārikṣita's capital is called by the general epithet of 'Āsandīvant' (possessing the throne),[1] instead of the famous Hāstinapura, showing that these brāhmans were usually shown into a 'throne'-room or audience-hall of the King, and that was all that they saw of the court; the other things striking them being, the awful 'gate-keeper' with his staff, the royal disburser of gifts which they appreciated, and the 'harem-superintendent' who conveyed to them reverence and presents from the court ladies.[2]

One of the King's 'council' of 'Ratnins' was a 'Grāmaṇī' which post was the highest ambition of the prosperous 'Vaiśyas'[3]; he may have been elected or nominated from the many 'grāmaṇīs' of the state.[4] This makes it quite possible that through these selected and aspiring 'grāmaṇīs' imitations of the royal court, and its style and structures spread into their respective 'grāmas' and 'mahāgrāmas'[5] (the bigger villages or townships).[6] Thus a 'grāma' also had its 'sabhā,'[7] where the 'grāmya-vādin' held court; some 'grāmas' may also have had 'purs,'[8] where the 'pur-pati,' a 'nātha' or 'ibhya,' would play the king.

Apart from these, the 'grāmas' must have had other constructive activities (individual or joint), of maintaining the interconnecting[1] roads,[2] or setting up grain-stores.[3] References to structural forms in the Vedic village are in fact fairly numerous,[4] though nowhere described systematically. Thus 'khala'[5] (floor of the granary), 'upānasa'[6] and 'ūrdara'[7] (granary)' indicate grain-storing arrangements in the village for the earlier period also. The village well ('avata,'[8] 'kūpa'[9]) had already its mechanism of water-wheels,[10] etc.; and dams[11] ('vartra')[12] were constructed to form tanks.[13] These structures could not have been of a rude primitive type, as the Āryans must have found these agricultural and irrigational arrangements already fully developed in the Dravidian village communities.[14]

---

[1] Ait. Brā. VIII, 21; Śat. Brā. XIII, 5, 4, 2; cf. Śāṅkh. Śr. Sūt. XVI, 9, 1.

[2] These points are copiously illustrated in all traditional stories regarding the connections between brāhmaṇs or ṛṣis and the courts.

[3] Taitt. Saṃ. II, 5, 4, 4; Mait. Saṃ. I, 6, 5; cf. Weber: Ind. Stud. 10, 20, n. 2; also Śat. Brā. V. 3, 1, 5. For references to the post of 'grāmaṇī' in Ṛv., Yv., Av. and Brā.s, vide V.I., I, 247, n. 25-28 and 31.

[4] It is however possible that the 'grāmaṇī' here is the 'mayor of the capital city'; if Ayodhyā could be called a 'grāma,' a city official also could be called a 'grāmaṇī' by retired ṛṣis knowing no better.

[5] Jaim. Upan. Brā. III, 13, 4.

[6] The idea of introducing styles of the capital city into other towns and villages is quite ancient, being referred to in the Vāts. Kā. Sūtra as one of the primary functions of the metropolitan 'goṣṭhīs' (a much earlier institution).

[7] Also 'samiti' and 'āmantraṇa:' vide ante.

[8] The ancient Kṣatriya ballads (e.g. *re* Pṛthu) in the Pur. mention 'grāma-durgas' as unnecessary or disappearing under a strong ideal king; these would thus seem to have been something like 'adulterine castles.'

The house construction outlined in the Atharvaveda[15] evidently refers to the ordinary type of dwelling-house in a village settlement, such as a brāhmaṇ would either himself possess,[16] or consecrate with mantras for the villagers under his ministration. Such a house was apparently characterized by these features:—(1) 'Upamit's 'pratimit's and 'parimit's: which seem to mean timber pillars and beams, in various positions, vertical, horizontal and slanting.[1] (2) 'Vaṃśa's: entire bamboos, probably used mainly for the framework of the roofing, the central horizontal bamboo, supported on the 'sthūṇā' or main pillar, being pre-eminently the 'vaṃśa.' (3) 'Akṣu': either, the wicker-work or split-bamboo lining, over which the thatch was laid,[3] and to which the description of 'thousand-eyed' could aptly be applied; or, a net, spread over the 'viṣūvant,' to keep the straw-bundles of the thatch intact during stormy weather.[4] (4) 'Palada'[5] and 'tṛṇa': bundles of hay, straw, or long reedy grass, for the 'chadis' (thatch), and probably for filling in or lining the walls. (5) 'Viṣūvant': the ridge on the top of the roofing, looking like parted hair.[6] (6) Various 'ties' joining the parts together, which evidently refer to bamboo and cane or rope work[7]; and 'śikya'[8]: suspensory arrangements (like slings of strong net, etc.). (7) ‘ Iṭa ’: which must be fine clay or unbaked bricks, rather than ‘ reedwork,’[1] used to finish off the walls, or floor or basement. (8) Several side-rooms with a central hall[2] (as indicated by ‘ pakṣas,’ ‘ wings,’[3] ‘ agniśāla,’ the hall of the fire-altar,[1] ' havirdhāna, ' the (sacrificial) store-room, and ' patnīnām sadana, ' women's apartments ('site and seat '), and with a covered ' verandāh ' running all around the house,[2] at the four corners of which were four thick-set pillars, probably of clay and rubble, or bricks[3]; altogether a ' bṛhacchandas '[4] house, on a large scale and of ample proportions, covered by a 'many-winged '[5] roofing. The prominence of bamboo, wicker-work, straw, and various ' ties ' in the construction, and other peculiarities noted above,[6] clearly point to the lower Gangetic origin of this style.[7] It is very remarkable that the Atharvaveda which describes it, is pre-eminently a book of the Āṅgirasas, who are definitely located in and associated with the very same lower Gangetic provinces in Purāṇic tradition.[8] Thus the Av. style of housing is Eastern[9]

---

[1] Chānd. Upan. VIII, 6, 2.

[2] In the Jātakas irrigation works are the joint concern of more than one settlement (e.g. of Sākyas and Koliyas).

[3] Bṛhad. Upan. VI, 3, 13. These grain-stores must have been (as they are even now sometimes) quite large and complex structures, of timber and bamboo, plastered walls and raised platform or stone bases, cylindrical, and with round dome-shaped top; a late medieval brick and stone model of such a capacious 'golā' ('round') is the famous imposing 'gol-ghar' of Pāṭnā; there may have been other masonry 'golās' in earlier times also; it is very likely that one of the sources of the 'stūpa' style is this village grain-store (with 'precious deposits') guarded with fencing, which was translated into stone. This might account for the 'Yakṣa' and 'Śrī' sculptures in the early Stūpa architecture. (Śrī as a goddess is known to Sat. Brā.).

[4] Vide ante for explanation.

[5] Rv. X, 48, 7 (Nir. III, 10); cf. Av. XI, 3, 9; VIII, 6, 15; Mait. Saṃ. II, 9, 6.

[6] Av. II, 14, 2; cf. Rv. X, 105, 4; the sense is a probable one; (cf. 'mahānasa').

[7] Rv. II, 14, 11 (Sāyaṇa)

[8] Vide V.I., I, 39-40.

[9] In Rv. and onwards; vide V.I., I, 177.

[10] Cf. 'kūcakra' (so taken by Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 157): Rv. X, 102, 11. 'Sūda' (in Rv. VII, 36, 3; IX, 97, 4; and in 'sūda-dohas,' VIII, 69, 3) may be=well. 'Parśu' in Rv. I, 105, 8; X, 33, 2) may mean the masonry sides of a 'kūpa,' with metal fittings, or ribbed, so as to resemble sickles. Similar ancient burnt clay pipes for shielding the sides of wells may be seen in the Pāṭnā Museum.

[11] Cf. 'sūrmi' (in Rv.)=water-pipes, and dug out water channels for irrigation.

[12] Or 'varta.' Av. I, 3, 7; Taitt. Brā. I, 6, 9, 1.

[13] 'Vār,' from Rv. onwards; 'veśantā' (and variants) from Av. onwards; vide V.I., II, 287 and 326, respectively.

[14] For the Dravidian basis of Āryan villages, vide Baden-Powell.

[15] Av. IX, 3; III, 12.

[16] It seems that purchase of such a house "with an 'udara' of treasures" is referred to in Av. IX, 3, 15.

---

[1] This is more probable than bamboo posts and props, as 'vaṃśa' is separately mentioned; so also in Ṛv. I, 59, 1 and IV, 5, 1, 'upamit' = pillar, probably of timber. Cf. the similar feature in the Bengal 'aṭcālā.'

[2] This term became early a technical one, denoting the main beam or ridge of any structure: e.g. the architectural sections of some Purāṇas know of the 'vaṃśa' of a fort or palace, where it cannot mean bamboo. Cf. the sense of 'beam' in Śāṅkh. Āraṇ. VIII, 1 and in 'śālā-vaṃśa,': Ait. Āran. III, 2, 1.

[3] This is better than 'thatched covering' or 'pole with countless holes'; it corresponds to the 'cāṭāi' and 'jāli' of modern structures; cf. the current description 'cokh-cokh' ('with many eyes') of such wicker-work linings.

[4] 'Thousand-eyed' would apply equally to such covering net, which may have been of ropes or split-cane; this sense is perhaps better, as 'akṣu' is said to the stretched as 'opaśa' on the 'viṣūvant,' so that the net would correspond to the finer net used to hold together the coiffure and stray curls.

[5] With 'palada' and the cognate forms 'palālī (= 'yava' -straw: Av. II, 8, 3), 'palāva' (Av. XII, 3, 19; Jaim. Upan. Brā. I. 54, 1), and 'palāla' (= straw: Kauś. Sūt. LXXX, 27), may be compared the Eastern vernacular 'powāl,' also a term specially used in house-building. A long grass, 'śirki' is still used in N. Bihār for such protective linings.

[6] As it actually does even now, the cut ends of the bundles of hay along the top being turned inside down and bound, so that the loose ends fall on either side. For the simile, cf. the 'akṣu' spread over the roof is like an 'opaśa' (woman's coiffure); the house itself is likened to a 'vadhū' (and carried like her, on waggons probably, when dismantled); it (i.e. its spirit) is addressed as 'mānasya patnī,' and is 'clothed' in grass, etc.; and the wife enters the new house first. (So also in subsequent thought the wife is 'gṛhiṇī' as well as 'gṛha.' Cf. 'the nest upon nest and vessel upon vessel' of the Av. verse in connection with this house).

[7] E.g. 'saṃdaṃśa,' 'prāṇāha,' etc.

[8] The modern 'śike' (Beng.), suspended from the roof to hold vessels and gourds, etc.; they are sometimes made of woven cane and ornamental designs. This may well have been the origin of the 'ornamental hangings' of later classical styles, as illustrated in Ajaṇṭā cave temples,* just as the whole of this type of dwelling-house is the source of many later stone-architectural features.

* Griffith's Ajantā Plates, No. 6, 10, 13; and Konow's Karpūramañjarī, n. p. 289, referred to in Whitney and Lamman: Av. p. 526 where 'śikya' is taken as = such 'ornamental hangings.'

---

[1] With this ‘ iṭa,’ cf. the Eastern vern. forms ‘ iṭ ’ (W. Beng.), ‘ iṭā ’ (E. Beng. and Bihār, etc.), ‘ iṭāwā ’ (S. Bihār and Ch. Nāgpur). That ‘ iṭ ’ originally meant ‘ clay,’ is shown by the expressions ‘ kāñcā iṭ ’ and ‘ pākkā iṭ ’ (= ‘ pakva ’), and the term ‘ eṭel ’ or ‘ āiṭlā ’ used of fine river clay, suitable for bricks. Unburnt bricks and such clay are still used to finish and line the reed-walls or wattle. ‘ Iṭa ’ occurs in only another passage of Av. VI, 14, 3.* In both the Av. passages, ‘ iṭa ’=clay (or unbaked brick in IX, 3) suits better than the usual rendering of bulrush or reeds; in VI, 14, 3, it would mean the river-clay or silt washed away every year, and in the other passage it would mean the clay-plastering or ‘ kāñcā-iṭ ’-facing, which had to be dismantled while the doors were taken off (cf. the application of the verse in Kauś. Sūt., 66, 24). It is evident that this ‘ iṭa ’ ‘ iṭ,’ etc.) has been sanskritised into ‘ istaka ’ by analogy; the original word seems to have been pre-Āryan, with an r or l associated with the ṭ, the relic of which may be seen in ‘ eṭel ’ and ‘ āiṭlā ’ (and place-names like ‘ Iṭli ’ (Beng.) or ‘ Iṭārsi ’ (C. P.)). So also, in Tāmil (in the mod. form of which ‘ ṭ ’ is pronounced ‘ ḍ ’), ‘ iṭ(ḍ)a,’† means to ‘ dig or dig out ’; and ‘ iṭa-ppu ’ and ‘ iṭa-van ’ (with which cf. ‘ iṭawā ’ above, the place-names ‘ Iṭāwā ’ (south U. P.) and ‘ Iḍāvā ’ (Travancore), and Tāmil ‘ iḍam ’=site, house) mean ‘ clod of earth.’ The Tāmil for brick is ‘ iṭṭikā ’; probably this is the original of ‘ iṣṭakā ’; cf. the curious question in Śat. Brā. X, 5, 1, 5, as to the (fem.) form ‘ iṣṭakā,’ and its fanciful answer: the real explanation is the original Dravidian form ‘ iṭṭikā ’ (or the like,—the ending representing the Tām. suffix ‘ vakā ’). The use of clay and bricks therefore would seem to have been a Dravidian feature (of the Gangetic country) early introduced amongst the Vedic Āryans. This is confirmed by the curious Atharvavedic invocation of the dwelling-house as ‘ Iḍā ’ in the marriage ritual (Av. XIV, 2, 19); this ‘ Iḍā ’ of course corresponds to the Dravidian forms meaning dwelling-house, traces of which may be found in the very ancient place-names of Mithilā (=Mithi+ilā), Kāmpilla (=Kāmpi+illu; cf. Māvella), or (the city) Kṛmilā (=Kṛmi+iḷā); cf. ‘ Vi-deha (°gha) ’ and ‘ Vai-śālī ’ (vide ante); cf. also Tāmil ‘ illu ’=house, ‘iḍa ’=royal seat, ‘ iḍa-vakā ’=principality, parish or abode, ‘ iḍa til ’=in the ‘ seat ’ or homestead, etc.

* The Ṛgvedic proper name ‘ Iṭa ’ may well be derived from ‘iṭ,’ to wander, and would properly apply to a ‘ yāyāvara ’ ṛṣi : Rv. X, 171, 1; cf. ‘ Iṭant Kāvya ’ : Kauṣ. Brā. VII, 4; Pañc. Brā. XIV, 9, 16.

† Is this connected with ‘ iḍā=sacrifice, which involved digging out? cf. ‘ utkara ’=the waste earth thrown up by such sacrificial digging, and the detailed digging ‘ mantras ’ in the Yv. sacrificial ritual.

[2] The features noticed here are characteristic of the famous ‘ Bāṅglā ’ (bungalow) style.

[3] Cf. the ‘ pakṣa’s of a ‘ śālā ’ in: Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXX, 5; Taitt. Brā. I, 2, 3, 1; such a side-room was probably the ‘ āgara : ’ Av. IV, 36, 3.

---

[1] This must have been the central room (cf. Agni as embryo within the many-winged house), to escape dangers of fire,—and also the front room which would be first entered (as is shown by many incidental references, e.g., in the Epics); it was also the Vedic sitting-room, from the connection of the fire-altar with the sabhā. The ' havirdhāna ' would be either the adjoining back-room, or one of the smaller side-rooms, where the ' soma vehicle ' could be dragged up and housed.

[2] At least along the front and back, if a 2-' winged ' house.

[3] The ' verandāh ' and 4 thick pillars are inferable from the description in Av. IX, 3, 17 :—" covered with ' tṛṇa ' and clothed in ' palada,' the ' niveśanī ' is like a she-elephant with feet "; here the reference is evidently to the elephant with its fringed trappings and stout thick set legs, always clay-covered and clay-hued; the pillars could not have been of timber, for heavy timber work is incompatible with the ' bamboo ' style; thus it is better to take them as rubble or raw-brick pillars; they cannot have been the ' upamits,' for these along with the slanting beams and the resultant angles would be filled in by walls (wattle or clay), so that they would be undistinguishable as four thick legs; thus these ' legs ' were independent corner-pillars, which, being under the same thatch (=the elephant's body, whose very curve of the back is like the ridge of such a house), necessarily implies the ' verandāh ' border, a characteristic feature of the Gangetic style.

[4] ' Chandas ' here may be compared with ' chāñd ' (Beng.), a parallel structural term, implying the ideas of proportion, scale, or measurement, which is also the sense of ' chandas ' as applied to prosody; besides, as grains and cattle, as well as men are included within this ' bṛhacchandas ' house, ' proportions ' would suit better than ' roof,' cf. also the ' atichandas ' and other ' chandas ' bricks of Yv. altar construction.

[5] 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 ' wings ' (implying as many ' rooms '); cf. the division of structures in Bengal according to ' roofing ' : ' do-cālā ' (a poor man's house); ' cau-cālā (a thriving villager's house), and ' āṭ-cālā ' (a big open hall, used as the village ' sabhā ').

[6] Vide foot-notes above.

[7] It is not necessary to go to the Nīlgiri Ṭodās for the Vedic type of dwelling-house or for the originals of cave architecture (cf. V.I., I, 231).

[8] The significance of this point has been illustrated in several other sections of this dissertation.

[9] This may be the significance of the ' first homage to the greatness of the house ' being paid from the ' prācya ' quarter (Av. IX, 3, 25).

(i.e. Deltaic) and Āṅgirasa (brāhmaṇic); but it may have been very early introduced-into other parts of N. India,[1] with the westward progress of the Āṅgirasas and other Eastern groups.[2] Accordingly, references to some of its features are not rare in other parts of the Vedic literature as well.[3]

But this type of dwelling-houses cannot have been the only one in the Vedic ages, and other varieties must have developed according to regional conditions, etc. This is indicated by references to the use of materials other than the characteristically deltaic, for various structural purposes, e.g., of timber, burnt bricks, stone or metal; and by mentions of other 'parts' of houses, not named or prominent in the sketch of the above type. Thus doors and pillars do not form a special feature in this, but they are very frequently referred to in Vedic literature, and lead to various figurative uses. 'Dur,'[4] the earlier and commoner word for door,[5] has an implied sense of the whole house,[1] and 'durya' (doorposts),[2] 'duryoṇa'[3] and 'duroṇa,'[4] all signify the house itself; such use is an indication that much was thought of the timber doorway, on which was probably lavished all the skill of the Vedic carpenter and carver.[5] 'Skambha,' pillar (of timber),[6] is often used figuratively; the somewhat later 'stambha'[7] was probably sometimes a brick or stone one; 'sthāṇu'[8] (the prominence of which is indicated in the use of 'sabhā-sthāṇu') and 'sthūṇā'[9] are other quite common and early names for pillars (of houses or other structures), made of timber as well as other materials[10]; and the 'sthūṇā-rāja'[11] must belong to a biggish complicated structure. Smaller timber posts were 'svaru's[12] and 'yūpa's,[13] used as door-frames, etc., and 'methi 's[1] posts for palisades. Apart from these varieties, used chiefly in houses, other pillars of different uses are indicated by 'śaṅku '[2] (of timber as well as stone) and 'drupada,'[3] with which latter may be compared 'skambha ' and 'vanaspati '[4] (a pole or pillar,, evidently a dressed and entire pine or 'śāla ' trunk). This great variety of names for pillars and posts, and the importance of these and doors, shows that they were a marked feature of at least one other type of house-building. Thus, as compared with the 'Deltaic,' there would seem to have existed a Middle-Himālayan (and submontane) style also, characterized by skilled, heavy and profuse timber-work : of which, again, the later and modern parallel is equally striking.[5]

---

[1] According to Chinese accounts (Ssu-mā-chien's Hist. of Chāng-kien's career and embassies), bamboos were imported from the Gangetic Delta as far up as the outlying North Western region of Tā-hiā (Bactria), as early as the 2nd century B.C., when it was regarded as a very ancient trade. The source of this overland and maritime trade in bamboos, etc. was S. China and adjacent Indo-China. (This agrees with the affinity between East Indian and Indo-Chinese types of house-structure, and the fact that Further-Indian bamboos (being more solid) are still used in house-structures in some parts of Bengal).

[2] Vide Pargiter: AIHT., p. 219ff.

[3] E.g.—"Vaṃśa': bamboo rafters or beam (Rv. I, 10, 1; Mait. Sam. IV, 8, 10, etc.). 'Akṣu': (Rv. I, 180, 5 (prob.)). 'Śikya': (apart from Av. XIII, 4, 8, in) Taitt. Sam. V, 2, 4, 2, 3; 6, 9. 1; etc.; Śat. Brā. V, 5, 4. 28; VI, 7, 1, 16. Also 'chadis' (covering) and 'upamit.'—rather more general terms, not restrictable to the above type. ('Chadis': Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 2, 9, 4; 10, 5, 7; Vāj. Saṃ. V. 28; Ait. Brā. I. 29. Śat. Brā. III, 5, 3, 9, etc. Cf. 'chadis' of bridal wagon: Rv. 85. 10. 'Upamit': Rv. I, 59, 1; IV. 5. 1). But 'iṭa' and 'palada,' etc., do *not* occur elsewhere. 'Ātā' may be a primitive Āryan word, but the fact that it is used of "the doors of the sky," shows that the Vedic poet had in mind not a rectangular timber framework for the wooden door, but rather a vaulted or arched framework of bamboo (cf. the style represented at the entrances to caves and cave temples), such as would properly belong to the above style ('ātā:' Rv. I. 56, 5; 113, 14; III, 43, 6; IX, 5, 5; Vāja. Sam. XXIX, 5). The door-fittings indicated by 'syūman' ('door-strap': Rv. III, 6, 1. 4), and 'dvāra-pidhāna' ('door-binder': Śat. Brā. XI, 1, 1, 1), are referable to the same style, while 'argala' and 'iṣīkā' ('bar and pin' of cow-pen: Śāṅkh. Āraṇ. II, 6) would rather belong to timber structures; (cf. 'vraja' constructed of 'aśvattha' wood). The frequenter use of 'gṛha' in the plural to designate the house (vide the many refs. in V.I. I, 229) shows that a number of rooms was a common feature; this may have been due to the early adoption of the above style of house-building with a number of 'pakṣa's (two to ten).

[4] Rv. I. 68. 10; 113. 4; 121. 4: 188. 5; etc.

[5] 'Dvār' in Rv. I. 13. 6: Av. VIII. 3. 22; XIV. 1, 63; Vāja. Sam. XXX, 10: Śat. Brā. XI. 1, 1. 2; etc.; 'dvāra' in Av. X. 8. 43 (nava-dvāra); and Ait. Brā. onwards.

---

[1] Thus 'dur-ya' (in masc. pl.) = 'belonging to the door, or to the house': Rv. I, 91, 19; X, 40, 12; Taitt. Saṃ. 1, 6, 3, 1; Vāj. Saṃ. I, 11.

[2] (In fem. pl.) 'durya' = dwelling or doorposts: Rv. IV, 1, 9. 18; 2, 12; VII, 1, 11.

[3] Rv. I, 174, 7; V. 29, 10; 32, 8.

[4] Rv. III, 1, 18; 25, 5; IV, 13, 1; V, 76, 4; etc. Av. VII, 17, 3; Vāj. Saṃ. XXXIII, 72, etc.

[5] For such skilled artisans, cf. 'takṣan's: Rv. X, 86, 5; Av. XIX, 49, 8; cf. Rv. I, 161, 9; III, 60, 2; 'tvaṣṭṛ': Av. XII, 3, 33; also 'taṣṭṛ' in Rv. (vide V.I., I, 302). These artisans could make decorated and inlaid (piś) bowls like the starry night (Av. XIX, 49, 8), or the lotus (the 'puṣkara' bowl of ritual), and could produce 'rūpam sukṛtam' (sculptured designs and friezes?) with their chisels, and bowls had such carvings in relief of gods, etc. (Av. XII, 3, 33). Cf. 'priyā taṣṭāni vi-aktā' of Rv. X, 86, 5.

The 'takṣans' are respectable in the Rv. but have become low castes in the Buddhistic age (see V.I., II, 266); the best explanation would be that these "wood-carvers" naturally enough amalgamated with the Magadhan indigenous "stone-workers" (vide infra.), and though as a result the crafts were much improved e.g. by renderings of wood-work in stone (as in the Buddhistic period). the craftsmen themselves suffered in status.

[6] Rv. I, 34, 2; IV, 3, 5; that it was originally a timber pillar is shown by the vern. 'khāmbā' = specially an entire 'śāla' trunk; cf. the expr. 'lāṭhā-khāmbā' (an arrangement for drawing well-water), where 'khāmbā' has that sense; (it is to be noted that the later monoliths are also called 'lāṭh's; e.g. 'Jarāsandha ki lāṭh'.).

[7] Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXX, 9; XXXI, 1; and often in Sūtras. For the implication of brick or stone material, cf. the vern. use of 'thāṃ,' 'thāmbā,' as compared with 'khāmbā.'

[8] Rv. X, 40, 13; Av. X, 4, 1; XIV. 2, 48; XIX, 49. 10; etc.

[9] Rv. I, 59, 1; V, 45, 2; 62, 7; VIII, 17, 14. Av. XIV, 1, 63; Śat. Brā. XIV, 1, 3, 7; etc.

[10] Eg. 'ayaḥsthūṇa' or the sthūṇā on the grave (Rv. X, 18, 13), which may have been of clay or brick. So also the 'sthūṇā-rāja' may occasionally have been of bricks, etc.

[11] Śat. Brā. III, 1, 1, 11; 5, 1, 1.

[12] Rv. I, 92, 5; 162, 9, III, 8, 6, etc; Av. IV, 24, 4; XII, 1, 13; etc.

[13] Rv. I, 51, 14.

To this timber architecture would naturally[6] belong the references to the use of metals in house-construction, such as the 'ayaḥsthūṇa 's[7] (copper, bronze or iron pillars) and 'parigha's[8] (metal bolts); and they must have been very well-known and prominent features to be used early as proper names.[9] There is no improbability involved in this, as in the early Vedic age 'ayas ' was widely used,[10] and smelting[11] and beaten[1] 'ayas'[2] are referred to; the 'ayaḥsthūṇa's and 'āyasī pur's would thus imply the strengthening of timber pillars, palisades or walls, by copper or steel[3]-plating and sundry metal fittings. This would constitute a necessary earlier stage of architecture to account for the elaborate gold-plated and inlaid timber-pillars of the fourth century Mauryan palace.

---

[1] With variants 'medhi,' 'methī,' or 'meṭhi ':—Av. VIII, 5, 20; XIV, 1, 40; Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 2, 9, 4; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXXV, 8; Ait. Brā. I, 29, 22; Śat. Brā. III, 5, 3, 21; Pañc. Brā. XIII, 9, 17; Jaim. Brā. I, 19, 1;—for use in palisades, cf. Rv. VIII, 53, 5.

[2] 'Śaṅku ' usually = wooden post, peg, or even pin (in Rv. and Brā.s—vide V.I., LI, 349); but a stone pillar, in 'vṛtra-śaṅku ' : Śat. Brā. XILI, 8, 4, 1 (cf. ibid. IV, 2, 5, 15, and scholiast on Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XXI, 3, 31).

[3] Rv. I, 24, 13; IV, 32, 23; Av. VI, 63, 3; 115, 2; XIX, 47, 9; Vāja. Saṃ. XX, 20; for use as posts for victims and offenders : cf. Rv. I, 24, 13, and Av. XIX, 47, 9 above, and Av. XIX, 50, 1; VI, 84, 4 (=63, 3 above); also Rv. VII, 86, 5.

[4] Av. IX, 3, 11; Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 2, 8, 4.

[5] Thus the rich carved wood-work and timber structures of the lower hills and slopes of the Southern Himālayas (from Kāśmīr and Yamunā sources to Eastern Nepāl, and the submontane plains (e.g. Shaharanpur and other districts) have all along been famous and characteristic of those parts. (Cf. the place-names : 'Kāṭh-maṇḍu ' and 'Kāṭh-godām ').

[6] So also, excellence in metal work is found side by side with that in wood-work in the above region (cf. the well-known artistic products in this line of Nepāl, Moradabad, etc.).

[7] Rv. V, 62, 7, 8.

[8] Chānd. Upan. II, 24, 6. 10. 15; (and often later).

[9] 'Ayaḥsthūṇa ' : Śat. Brā. XI, 4, 2, 17 (the name belongs to an earlier age) : 'Parigha ' : a king's name in the Purāṇic genealogy (Yādava), step No. 42.

[10] In arrows, kettles, cups, etc. (in Rv.).

[11] 'Dhmātā ' smelter; 'dhmātarī,' smelting furnace : Rv. V. 9, 5; smelting : Rv. IV, 2, 17; feather-bellows : Rv. IX, 112, 2; smelting ores (aśman) : Śat. Brā. VI, 1, 3, 5.

The first explicit mention of the use of burnt bricks ('pakva') for structural purposes occurs rather late, in the Śatapatha[4] (6th—7th cent. B.C.); but even there, this 'pakva' and the 'iṣṭakā,' which is used throughout, are taken as identical; and as the reference is to the building of sacrificial fire-altars, it is clear that this use of 'burnt' bricks was more or less traditional,[5] and not a recent innovation[6]; besides, various well-known personages are stated to have erected such fire-altars,[7] some of whom can be approximately fixed in time with the help of 'traditional' chronology: so that such constructions would go back to the earlier Vedic period.[8] 'Iṣṭakā' is indeed the traditional material[9] for building the fire-altar even in the Yv. Saṃhitās[10]; and though not specially called 'burnt,' these bricks were almost certainly so: for it is often stated there by way of explanation, that bricks were invented apparently by the Aṅgirasas) to save Earth from being excessively burnt[1] by the sacrificial fire[2]; their supporting strength[3] and capacity of resisting the waters[4] are often specified; and amongst the many types of bricks used, were the 'svaymātṛṇṇā'[5] or 'naturally perforated' bricks, and 'bricks of all colours,'[6] the former being a characteristic product of the kiln,[7] and the latter probably referring either to the various shades of red in the brick-piles, or to enamelled bricks[8]; while mortar ('purīṣa') that could be compared to flesh adhering to bones,[9] had probably an admixture of pounded red bricks. The art of brick-laying was an old and developed one in the Yajurvedic age, judging from the great variety of names and forms of the alter-bricks, amongst which may be mentioned the 'circular bricks' ('maṇḍaleṣṭakā')[10] the 'earless' or corner-less bevelled bricks ('vikarṇī'),[11] the 'crest' or conical bricks ('coḍā'),[12] the 'gold-headed' bricks ('vāmabhṛt'),[13] the shaped 'pot'-bricks ('kumbheṣṭakā'),[14] and other bricks with various linear markings[15] and of different sizes.[16] Mortar (of mud and rubble, sand or pounded bricks) was freely used[1] in "making bricks firm,"[2] cementing successive layers of bricks,[3] and in plastering over[4]; such adhesive plasters must have been essential in the construction of the alternative forms of the altar,[5] like the 'bird'-styles (representing the 'śyena,' 'kaṅka' or 'alaja'), or the 'bowl' or 'granary' ('droṇa'), 'chariot-wheel,' 'circle,' 'cemetery' (śmaśāna), and 'triangle' models. Large numbers[6] of bricks were used 'for these altars: the measurements of one altar is given as 36 feet along the centre, E. to W., and 30 and 24 feet across at the back and front respectively, and it is said the outer limits of the measurements of the altar depends on what area the builder thinks he could very well use[7]; the first, second and third pilings are to be made of one, two and three thousand bricks respectively[8]; and the bricks ready before an altar-builder (who wishes those became his cows) are roundly estimated[9] at hundreds of thousands. The rites performed on leaving a homestead, with a view to re-establishment elsewhere, show that in the ordinary household also the altar was brick-built, and apparently these bricks were dismantled, carried to, and refitted in the new 'vāstu.'[10]. It would be extraordinary if bricks were not used for the secular house-buildings as well, while altars (household or special) and cemeteries[11] were brick-built. It is remarkable that throughout the "brick"—mantras, reference is made to "the manner in which Aṅgiras placed[12] the bricks firmly,"[13] or invented them,[14] or used them for better building of the fire-altar[1]; sometimes Bṛhaspati (also an Āṅgirasa) is introduced;[2] and the brick (Iṣṭakā) is addressed and worshipped as a goddess (‘ devī ’).[3] All this is strikingly similar to the expressions and notions of the architectural sections of the Purāṇas,[4] where the laying of bricks and other stages of house-construction are accompanied by references to the Āṅgirasas and their deified ‘ daughters.’ In view of what has already been said about the ordinary ‘ brāhmaṇic ’ dwelling-houses of the Gangetic type (as described in the ‘ Āṅgirasa Veda ’) and the use of clay and unburnt bricks (‘ iṭa ’) in them,[5] and of the fact that the dwelling-house is addressed in the same Veda as ‘ Iḍā ’ (which also is evidently connected with the Dravidian roots and words meaning digging, bricks, and house),[5]—the inference becomes irresistible, that this consistent association of the Āṅgirasas with the invention and use of ‘ iṣṭakā,’ in Vedic as well as Purāṇic tradition, is but another[6] indication of a fact of cultural history, that the civilization of ‘ brāhmaṇism,’ with its sacrificial cult and symbolism, its building activities and material achievements and equipments, was originally Gangetic, Eastern and non-Āryan. In any case, it is quite clear that a third structural style, characterized by the use of clay, plasters, and bricks, dried or baked (of diverse moulds and probably even enamelled sometimes) was already in existence in the 10th century B.C.,[7] being referred to in the Brāhmaṇas and the later Saṃhitās, and is implied for the earlier Ṛgvedic period[8]; and here too, the conclusion agrees with the regional indications of the references: for this style can only have arisen in the riparian districts along the north of the Ganges (middle and lower).

---

[1] For 'soma' vessels: Rv. IX, 1, 2.

[2] The use of 'sheet' iron is more probable than cast iron, though the antiquity of ore-smelting (probably pre-Āryan) and the quite early occurrence (cir. 300 A.D.) of massive and highly finished foundry products, may indicate an earlier long standing use of cast iron posts and rods for structural purposes.

[3] Indian steel was well-known in the far Western countries in the 6th and 5th cents. B.C., and was as much prized by the Greeks in the 4th as tributes of precious gems. It is quite likely, therefore, that 'steel' should have been variously used for strengthening defences within India itself, before its fame spread abroad.

[4] Śat. Brā. VI, 1, 2, 22; VII, 2, 1, 7; in the former passage it is said that the 'pakva' is called 'iṣṭakā' because it is 'iṣṭa,' offered to the fire (the derivation being a late etymological fiction; cf. the fanciful explanation of the form 'iṣṭakā' rather than '°a' or '°aṃ': ibid. X, 5, 1, 5; also vide ante, *re* 'iṭa'); in the latter, a special 'black' 'pakva' is made by baking the brick in 'rice-husk' fire. 'Pakva' in Rv., Av., and Brā., means simply 'baked,' or 'cooked food' (vide V.I., s.v.); in Rv. VI, 63, 9, however, the sense of baked bricks, or a 'house of baked bricks' (a 'puccā' house), may suit quite well (as horses, slaves, chariots, etc., are given away by certain Kings, Puraya, etc., to the priest, along with 'pakva'). (N.B.—The substantives are all understood in this passage.)

[5] I.e., representing Yajurvedic (Vājasaneya) tradition of a much earlier age.

[6] Cf. the conservatism of the Śatapatha regarding proposed changes in Ṛgvedic texts (and to a less extent in Yv. texts).

[7] E.g. Tura-Kāvaṣeya: Śat. Brā. IX, 5, 2, 15; Śyāparṇa-Sāyakāyana: ibid. VI, 2, 1, 39; IX, 5, 2, 1.

[8] E.g. Tura-Kāvaṣcya, temp. Janamejaya-Pārikṣita I, cir. 20 steps above the close of the Ṛgvedic period.

[9] Cf. 'iṣṭaka-cit': Taitt. Saṃ. I, 5, 8, etc.

[10] E.g. the IVth and Vth books of the Taitt. Saṃ. (mantras and explanatory matters *re* 'agnicayana'). The details regarding altar construction in these are practically the same as in the Śat. Brā., thus showing that the use of bricks was traditional and almost co-existent with brāhmaṇism.

---

[1] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 2, 10; 5, 2, etc.

[2] It is indeed only natural that the use of the baked bricks should have early suggested itself for sacrificial structures, for the properties of burnt clay would be evident to any fire-worshipper; besides, with the growing ritual importance and significance of the altar, square or rectangular bricks must have been invented or adapted, and these, if unbaked at first would soon suggest the burnt brick.

[3] E.g. the 'aṣāḍhā brick of thousandfold strength,: Taitt. Sam. IV, 2. 9; 'the brick that quaketh not' ('svayamātṛṇṇā'): ibid. IV, 3, 6; V, 3, 2; 'Bṛhaspati saw in bricks the support of sacrifice': ibid. V, 3, 5; 'brick-altar' representing 'the firm earth in the midst of waters: ibid. V, 6, 4.

[4] E.g. Taitt. Saṃ., V, 6, 4 (in n. 3 above): 'bricks keeping the altar from being swept away by waters': ibid. V. 3, 10.

[5] Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 2, 9; 3, 2; 3, 6; 4, 10; V, 2, 8; 3, 2; etc.

[6] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 7, 8.

[7] This is called 'jhāmā' in vern., meaning perforated (cf. the cognate words 'jhāñjhrā,' and 'jhañjhāri,' of same signification).

[8] Enamelled earthenware and tiles have long been a speciality of the lower Middle-Gangetic districts (Eastern U. P.).

[9] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 2, 3.

[10] Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 4, 5; V, 3, 9; etc.

[11] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 3, 7; etc. (These were always placed topmost, and over the 'nākasad' or 'vault-sitter' bricks: apparently by way of ornamentation).

[12] Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 4, 3 (also placed, like 'vikarṇī' bricks, on the top, over the 'vault-sitters'); V. 3, 7; etc.

[13] Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 2, 9; V, 5, 3; 5, 5; 7, 6; 7, 9; etc. [*Cf.* enamelled bricks of the 3rd millennium B.C. at the recently excavated Sindh-Punjab sites.]

[14] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 6, 1; etc.

[15] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 2, 3; 2, 10 (cf. S.B.E. xliii, p. 21,, n. 1, *re* lines on square and rectangular bricks): of the various types of linear markings named in Āpast. Sūtra, at least one is known to Taitt. Saṃ.: cf. ibid. V, 7, 8.

[16] The Sūtras have 4 traditional sizes for the square brick: measuring 'pāda,' 'aratni,' 'urvasthi,' and 'aṇūka'; the various shapes noted above of course involve different sizes.

---

[1] E.g. in Taitt. Saṃ. I, 2, 12; II, 6, 4.

[2] E.g. in Taitt. Saṃ V, 2. 3.

[3] E.g. in Taitt. Saṃ. V, 6, 10. Cf. 'seasonal' bricks being "the internal cement of the layers"; ibid. V, 4, 2.

[4] 'Just as bone is covered with flesh': Taitt. Saṃ. V, 2, 3.

[5] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 4, 11. (The structural peculiarities of some of these types, according to the Sūtra comment, were: a round-topped block (the head) for the 'kaṅka'; curved 'wings,' for the 'śyena'; 'caturasra' *or* 'parimaṇḍala' (square *or* round) blocks for the 'granary' ('droṇa'); and square *or* round form for the 'śmaśāna').

[6] Cf. similar large numbers in the Śat. Brā. 'agnicayana' directions: e.g. 756 bricks: Śat. Brā. X, 5, 4, 5.

[7] Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 2, 4.

[8] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 6, 7; (the height of altars being up to knee, navel, and neck, respectively).

[9] Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 4, 11 ("these bricks ...... hundred ...... hundred thousand millions"). Cf. ibid. V, 4, 2.

[10] Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 4, 10. Cf. the dismantling of 'iṭa' etc., and carrying of them in the Atharva-vedic mantras (vide ante.).

[11] The direction that brick-altars could be erected after the model of (round or square) śmaśānas,' shown that these latter were also brick structures by the time of the Yv. Saṃhitās.

[12] Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 2, 9; 4, 3; etc.

[13] So also in Śat. Brā the expression is repeated: e.g. X, 5, 1, 5 ('sādana, settling of the brick, may be the original for the vern. phrase 'iṭ sājāna').

[14] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 5, 2; cf. V, 2, 10; so also bricks are said to have been "fashioned by the toils of seers like metres": V, 3, 5.

It is in the Satapatha again, that the first clear mention of stone structures of a recognizable type is made,—but in a way that would indicate a well-formed, distinct and traditional style. Its remarks on the erection of 'śmaśānas' (over burnt or buried bodies) are significant. They show a marked difference in the contemporary modes of building[1] these funeral and memorial structures. The 'Prācya' mode of erecting tombs is strongly disapproved[2] (from the point of view of the Kuru-Pāñcāla and Videha[3] brāhmaṇ). Apart from minor differences within the approved range as regards special forms for the several orders,[4] the structural type that is regarded as unorthodox is described clearly as round and dome-shaped ('parimaṇḍalā')[5]; that whereby the Easterners make the 'śmaśāna' "separate from the earth" unlike good people,[6] is described by the usual Vedic word for a large hemispherical bowl,[7] 'camū,' which must here refer to something like a vault or dome of solid stone or bricks[8]; the structure is then 'enclosed by an indefinite number of enclosing stones'[9]; and

---

[1] Taitt. Sam. V, 3, 5.

[2] Vide n. 14, page 37. (Some special forms of altar-bricks or manner of laying are associated with Viśvāmitra and his contemporaries: this may indicate the taking up of brāhmaṇical sacrificial cult and connected brick-building by the Ailas in that period).

[3] Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 2, 9; cf. the house goddess ‘ mānasya patnī ’ fixed by the gods in the beginning (Av. III, 12, 5), and Bṛhaspati first putting together the house (Av. IX, 3, 2-3). (Vide p. 31, and notes 7 and 8 in it.)

[4] Cf. the ‘ vāstu-māna ’ sections of Agni, Garuḍa, and Matsya.

[5] Vide ante.

[6] Cf. the same indication in the evidence about ‘ furniture ’ etc., infra.

[7] [Evidences of a highly developed art of making bricks, glass and glazed pottery of various sorts, dating from cir. 3000 B.C., have been discovered very recently in the upper and lower Indus plains. It is thus quite probable that the literary evidence with regard to the use of bricks, etc., in the Gangetic plains is trustworthy.]

[8] For the Yajurvedic altar and bricks must have been known to the sacrificial hymns of Ṛv.; cf. also the occurrence and sense of ‘ pakva in Ṛv. VI, 63, 9, and the Brāhmaṇa allusions to Ṛgvedic brick-altar builders (vide ante.).

---

[1] Śat. Brā. XIII, 8, 2, 1.

[2] Ibid. XIII, 8, 1, 5; 2, 1; cf. IX, 5, 1, 64.

[3] The preference for north-inclined and saline soil points to a Videha origin of these views.

[4] Ibid. XIII, 8, 2, 6-12; 3, 11.

[5] Ibid. XIII, 8, 1.

[6] Ibid. XIII, 8, 2, 1.

[7] For pouring Soma; also = mortar for 'Soma' pressing, which would be of stone; probably the bowl was occasinally of stone, just as there were soma-cups of 'ayas'; (for the 'hemispherical vessel,' cf. vern. 'jām(b)-bāṭi' of same shape). For the metaphorical use of 'camū' in Rv. to mean vault or dome, vide infra.

[8] Cf. S.B.E. 44, 430, n. 1.

[9] Śat. Brā. XIII, 8, 2, 2; as in the case of the fire-hearth, and set up with formulæ. This stone enclosure might also belong to the orthodox style, but the context would rather give it to the other style. 'Stones' or 'bricks' are, however, alternative materials (without any preference for one or the other) in the Sūtra applications (vide Whitney Av., pp. 886-7) of Av. XVIII, 4, 55 (building a 'harmya' for the dead), where the left side of the piled mound is finally beaten over ('kuṭṭay'), i.e. made 'puccā,' with a number of śilā' or 'iṣṭakā' (the variant 'śalākā' is pointless;* cf. the frequent phrase 'şileṣṭakā' in the 'vāstu' section of Purāṇas). From these indications, and from the recognition of round forms in the construction of altars and śmaśānas in the later Saṃhitās (vide p. 37, n. 5, and p. 42) it would appear that the antagonism to round and stone structures displayed by the Śatapatha is a later development in the 7th century B.C., very likely due to the growing estrangement between Prācya and Midland religious and philosophical doctrines which ultimately found expression in the Buddhistic reformation.**

* So also in the application of AV. XVIII, 3, 50—51 (earth covering up like mother with 'sic' and wife with cloth), in Kauś. 86, 10, it is evidently śilā and iṣṭakā that are placed and not 'śalākā.'

** For recognition of round forms, cf. also Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 3, 2 and 3 (arrangement of bricks in a circle); IV, 4, 10 (placing of 'nakṣatra' bricks in a circle); and the 'maṇḍaleṣṭakā' (noted above).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

stones are used instead of the square bricks in the case of non-fire-worshippers.[1] The orthodox style of 'śmaśāna' is stated to be square or quadrilateral,[2] 'not separate from the earth,'[3] (i.e., not prominent and towering[4] like the banned type, and of 'earth and earthen' materials,—clay and bricks,—as opposed to stone), and bricks one foot square are used in its construction[5]; and a memorial mound like a fire-altar[6] is prescribed[7] for builders of the same.[8] It is evident that the former is the prototype of the Buddhistic, Eastern and heretical, 'stūpa' architecture of the very next epoch,—and through it of the 'Śaiva' temple styles of subsequent ages[9]; and that the latter is a specially 'brāhmaṇical' style, associated with sacrificial altars[10] and the middle Gangetic country, and thus with bricks[10] and rectilineal figures,—strikingly paralleled by the similar sacrificial and geometric style of squares and bricks in ancient Babylonia, and represented recognizably in some later forms of 'brāhmaṇical' temple architecture.[11]

---

[1] Śat. Brā. XIII, 8, 4, 11.

[2] Ibid. XIII, 8, 1, 1ff.

[3] Ibid. XIII, 8, 2, 1.

[4] The Śatapatha insists repeatedly on the 'śmaśāna' being not too large or high: e.g. XIII, 8, 1, 18 (an ordinary altar's size); 8, 2, 6—12 (generally and preferably to be knee-high, though structures as high as the thigh, hip, mouth and upstretched arm, might be allowed for vaiśyas, women, brāhmaṇs and kṣatriyas, respectively;—note Kṣatriya superiority).

[5] Ibid. XIII, 8, 4, 11; not 'marked' like altar-bricks.

[6] It is noteworthy that about 3 centuries later, Alexander used fire-altars as 'memorials,' apparently according to the Indian custom; to impress the Indians he is said to have built on the Beās (cf. the custom of building fire-altars on river-banks, indicated in Śat. Brā. and earlier as far back as the Ṛv.) stupendous and sculptured fire-altars of stone, which Candragupta later on utilized for sacrificial purposes.

[7] Śat. Brā. XIII, 8, 1, 1ff; sometimes 'without wings and tail,' i.e., in the form of a simple cubical altar, without the 3 adjacent cubes; the special recommendation of the Śatapatha is an irregular quadrilateral with sides joining at S. shorter than those at N.; but this may refer to the area enclosed by cords, within which the altar-like śmaśāna is raised.

[8] This may imply that those, on the other hand, who built (and worshipped at) the round stūpas, were similarly honoured by round funeral memorials. It may be noted here that worship of the funeral mound is implied in Av. XVIII, 4, 38 (it is thought to bestow boons on worshippers), and that the 'previous Buddhas' also had their 'stūpas.'

[9] Characterized by the round dome; it has been designated 'Dravidian' by Fergusson, but Havell rightly traces it to Buddhistic round forms and symbolism; ethnically of course the sources of this style may have been Dravidian (but Fergusson did not use it in this sense).

[10] Vide ante.

[11] Cf. the Southern style of Madurā, Tānjore, etc.; also in earlier monasteries of several stories, built pyramidically.

The 'Prācyas' referred to here cannot be those deltaic and riparian Easterners,[1] to whom the Atharva-vedic style of house-building must be attributed; the passages in the Śatapatha[2] may be taken to mean "the Āsurya section of the Prācyas," i.e., either the unorthodox Magadhan Prācyas or the Prācyas who follow Āsuri's tenets,—the proto-Buddhistic creeds (the association of round stone structures with them, in the latter case, being historically sound); the very allusion to solid stone or brick vaults, stone enclosures, and stones as substitutes for bricks, shows that the region meant is Magadha,[3] known as Prācī pre-eminently, in the 4th century B.C. [Magadha and Kīkaṭa are looked down upon in early as well as later Vedic literature[4]; and it is precisely these regions[5] which have an ancient tradition of stone masonry and ware; so also, when the cars of the Prācyas, the 'vipathas,'[6] are disapproved by Midlanders,[7] it is evidently the rough country of Kīkaṭa-

---

[1] Of Vaiśālī, Aṅga, Vaṅga, etc.; vide ante.

[2] Śat. Brā. XIII, 8, 1; 8, 2, 1.

[3] It is noteworthy that so far the earliest known remains of vaulted and polished caves, of stone enclosures, walls or pillars, are in Magadha or of Magadhan origin.

[4] E.g. in Vāja. Saṃ. XXX, 5, 22; or Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XXII, 4, 22; vide also note 6 below; Cf. also the famous Rv. reference, "Kiṃ te kṛṇvanti Kikaṭesu, etc." In Purāṇic tradition (cf. Vāyu. 78, 21—22) the land of Triśanku, bet. Kaikaṭa and the Mahānadī, is avoided by orthodox people. Kīkaṭa and Gayā are almost identical in Vā. 105—112. So also, the benighted region where Triśaṅku is banished seems from epic indications as well (cf. e.g. all that is said about Viśvāmitra, Mataṅga and his tirtha: Mbh. I, 71, 2925—28 with Hariv. V, 717ff.; III, 87, 8321 (in the East); III, 84, 8079; III, 85, 8159; XIII, 27—29 (Gayā); XIII, 3, 189 (in the South); cf. Varāha. V and VIII (conn. with Mithilā and Orissa) to have been no other than Kīkaṭa (cf. also popular traditions *re* Rhotasgarh and R. Karmanāśā). And if the Kīcakas of Mbh., whose country the Pāṇḍavas passed just before coming to Ekacakrā, and who cremated their lusty chiefs with their women, are the same as the Kikaṭas (vide infra. sec. *re* widow-burning),—it is another trace (even) in the epic literature of the low estimation of these Prācyas.

[5] Now represented by Gayā and Cunār; also similar regions westwards along the Vindhyan borderland, Jubbulpur, Gwalior and Jaipur, representing ancient Cedi and Matsya, very closely connected with Magadha in the Purāṇic tradition.

[6] Pañc. Brā. XVII, 1 (a very old passage); Lāṭ. Śr. Sūt. VIII, 6, 9.

[7] The difference between Magadha-Prācī and the Midlands in styles of living and housing is apparently also indicated by sundry statements in the Vedic literature like these;—Dwelling-houses are sometimes specifically called 'Ārya' (Rv. IX, 63, 14), which would be unnecessary if extra-Āryan types were not known or adapted from: the 'Vrātya gṛhapati' (Pañc. Brā. XVII, 1—4) is specified, and the 'Vrātya' chieftain with his attendant 'Māgadha' (Av. XV, 2) is described and glorified, 'Vrātya' here evidently meaning Magadhan; an Āryan was required to reside in a Niṣāda settlement (S. E. of Madhyadeśa, i.e., Kīkaṭa-Magadha) before performing the Viśvajit sacrifice (Kauṣ. Brā. XXV, 15; Pañc. Brā. XVI, 6, 8); and villages were close together and frequent in the East, but there were long stretches of forests in the West (Ait. Brā. III, 44), thus showing that architectural styles must have been largely of 'Eastern' origin.

Magadha[1] that is referred to.] 'Smaśāna' structures of the two types distinguished by the Śatapatha were evidently known in the earlier Yajurvedic period. Thus a fire-altar and a 'śmaśāna' are similarly piled, so that the former has to be differentiated by burying a 'living' tortoise in it[2]; again, certain altars are piled in the form of 'śmaśānas,' which, according to the Sūtra comment on the directions, are of two well-known types, round or square,[3] just as the 'drona's or 'grain-stores,' which also supply the models for other types of altar, were round or square structures.[4] In the Av. and Rv. also, it may be a round type of 'śmaśāna' that is set up, with "Swell thou up (ucchañcasva) . . . let the earth remain swelling up . . . let a thousand props support it"[5]; while the funeral structure that is said to be 'cayanena citam'[6] is obviously of the same type as the square altar. Knowledge of big round structures like the 'stūpas' (or 'camū's of the Prācyas) is suggested by the metaphorical use of 'camvā' in Rv. to denote the vault of heaven placed on the earth[7]; so also the Ṛgevdic use of the word 'stūpa' itself clearly shows that it was a structural term as well: thus Agni on the altar "extends up to the sun's disc with 'stūpa's of flames,'[8] and "Varuṇa upholds the 'stūpa' of light on the baseless firmament."[9]

The Śatapatha classifies 'śmaśāna' structures into the ordinary 'vāstu' or reliquary of bones, etc., 'gṛhāṇ' and prajñānaṃ.'[1] The first is evidently the tumulus, round or square, which forms the subject of so much comment in that Brāhmaṇa. The term 'gṛhāṇ' used of a special type of 'śmaśāna' is particularly interesting: properly it means a dwelling-house with many chambers; applied to a 'śmaśāna' it would signify that the funeral structure was either an actual house (mausoleum) with many rooms, erected over or beside the grave in memory of the deceased, and for the benefit of his soul dedicated to some religious order, or philanthropic use,[2] or that these 'gṛhāṇ' are the chambers and vaults of subterranean or rock-cut caves.[3] 'Gṛhāṇ,' however, is nothing new in the later Brāhmaṇa age, for the Av. (as well as the Rv.) mentions it frequently[4]: thus referring to a funeral structure it says,—"let these 'gṛhāsaḥ' be a refuge for him for ever"[5]; elsewhere, "make ye 'gṛha's for him according to his kindred "[1]; again, "as the 5 clans ('mānava') implanted a 'harmya' for Yama, so I implant a 'harmya' that there may be many of me."[2] It would be too much of a forced explanation to take 'gṛhān' as a metaphorical expression throughout, specially beside the technical sense[3] given to it by the Śatapatha; even in the Ṛgvedic description of the grave as a 'mṛṇmaya gṛha'[4] into which one goes down, though there is an element of figure, yet the use of 'gṛha' seems significant: it is possible that the phrase unconsciously refers to subterranean burial chambers or vaults. The 'prajñānaṃ' of the Śatapatha (beside the 'reliquary' and the 'chambers') can only mean some sort of a memorial monument, like a pillar. A pillar (sthūṇā) indeed is set up on the Ṛgvedic grave[5] (in the Av. also); and a 'loga' (pole) is erected after the earth is piled up ('ut-stabh') from about the grave[6]; and on the 'sthūṇā' 'maintained by the Fathers' 'Yama makes seats for the departed'[7]; and it is probably such memorial pillars (on which the spirits 'sit') that are referred to, where 'the bride-beholding fathers' are asked to be propitious to the bride as the marriage-procession passes a cemetery.[8] These 'prajñāna' pillars may have been of timber originally[9]; but as bricks or stone came to be used for the funeral tumuli,[1] these also would be of the same materials by and by; thus in the time of the Śatapatha a stone-pillar ('śaṅku')[2] was set up along with 3 timber ones at the four corners of the 'śmaśāna.'[3] The Buddhistic monolithic pillar, erected beside the relic-stūpas and on the highways and public thoroughfares,[4] is probably the developed form of such memorial 'śaṅkus' and the civic and sacrificial Vedic 'drupadas'[5] (symbolical of royal[6] and divine power[7]) to which offenders and sacrificial victims were bound: as the symbolism of the 'śmaśāna' structures developed with and under Buddhistic and proto-Buddhistic thought,[8] and as offenders ceased to be punished so brutally, and sacrifices fell into disuse, these 'śaṅku' and 'drupada' pillars would be used for ethical purposes and 'dhamma' edicts (just as the traditional royal hunt was transformed into missionary tours).[9] This is

---

[1] Where the 'śagad' and the 'ekkā' are still characteristic conveyances evoking much comment (for a humourous satire cf. the mod. Beng. ballad "Vighoro Vihāre cadinu ekkā," etc.). The 'śagad' is characterized by solid timber or stone wheels, 'śāla'-timber body and a peculiar drowsy long-drawn squeak heard from great distance (cf. 'śakaṭa' in the 'araṇyānī' hymn in Rv.; cf. also the peculiar construction of the traditional toy-cart, 'mṛt-śakaṭika'); it is comparatively low-built and drawn by buffaloes, and can be drawn over all sorts of rough tracks and regions. The (one-horsed) 'ekkā' is probably alluded to in Vedic passages where conveyances with a single horse are deprecated; (generally, in contrast with those with 2 or more horses: Rv. X, 131, 3; Taitt. Brā. I, 8, 2, 4; III, 8, 21, 3; Pañc. Brā. XVI, 13, 12; XVIII, 9, 7; Ait. Brā. V, 30, 6; Śat. Brā. XIII, 3, 3, 9; etc.; poor people content with one-horsed car: Rv. X, 101, 11; VI. 15, 19; Pañc. Brā. XXI, 13, 8; etc.). The 'ekkā' also is suited for rough country use, and might well be called 'vipatha.'

[2] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 2, 8, 5 (cf. also Kāṭh. Saṃ. III, 4, 7, *re* śmaśāna).

[3] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 4, 11, 3.

[4] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 4, 11; the Sūtra ascription of 'caturasra' and 'parimaṇḍala' styles to both funeral tumuli and grain-stores is interesting; vide ante *re* connection between 'stupas' and grain-stores

[5] Av. XVIII, 3, 50-51 = Rv. X, 18, 11-12.

[6] Av. XVIII, 4, 37.

[7] Rv. III, 55, 20.

[8] Rv. VII, 2, 1.

[9] Rv. I, 24, 7; 'stūpa' in Av. VI, 60, 1, is used of the round coil of hair on Aryaman's head; the figurative use here and elsewhere (vide V.I., s.v. 'stūpa' may well be compared with the comparison of the house-top with 'opaśa' and parting of the hair (vide ante).

---

[1] Śat. Brā. XIII, 8, 1; (cf. also comm. on it). For 'vāstu' in this sense, cf. Kapila-vāstu, where the sense must be "the memorial 'stūpa' of Kapila" rather than the 'abode of Kapila,' as usually taken. Kapila lived in the middle of the 8th century B.C. according to Purāṇic evidence (vide Pargiter: AIHT, pp. 330—332); hence, it is evident that the styles referred to in Śat. Brā.° were at least two centuries earlier than itself,—an important point.

[2] All this is characteristic of Buddhism in the very next epoch, and traces of Buddhistic features can only be expected in the later Vedic literature.

[3] This also would be a Buddhistic feature; relics were deposited in rock-cut caves in historical times; in the Epic the rock-cut caves of Girivraja are used for condemned prisoners or human victims, and other caves are also said to be similarly used; the Epic also knows of ascetics in subterranean caves; the Barābar caves may have been intended as memorial 'śmaśānas' of some Maurya emperors, presumably Aśoka, etc. The Roman catacombs and Egyptian cave-graves offer instructive parallels. Another remarkably Magadhan and Buddhistic feature found in the 'śmaśāna' of the Śatapatha is the regulation "let there be 'citras' on the back of the 'Śmaśāna,'" "for 'citras' mean offspring." (The comm. takes it as = natural scenery; this is absurd, specially as natural scenery is suggested as an alternative in the following lines). In the case of the brick-built tumuli, these 'citras' would be 'paintings' on suitable plaster, but in the case of the stone-built round 'camū' of the Easterners the most suitable 'citras' would be sculptured figures in relief; the nature of these 'citras' is indicated by the reason given: the figures painted or carved were of women and children, and possibly couples of men and women. It is interesting to compare the account in the Epic of the representation of the fertility goddess Jarā (or Jaṭā; cf. the traditional village spirit, Jaṭā-buḍi) on the palace walls of the King of Girivraja, of a plump woman with children all around, and also the panels of female figures, amorous couples, etc., in the later 'stūpa' and 'vihāra' architecture (cf. the Orissa temple sculptures).

[4] Besides, 'śmaśāna' and 'sadman' (house) are often spoken of as parallel things: e.g. Av. V, 31, 8; X, 1, 18; so also by burying a live tortoise an altar becomes a 'vāstavya' and not a 'śmaśāna' (Taitt. Saṃ. V, 2, 8, 5); (probably there is an implied pun on 'vāstu' here).

[5] Av. XVIII, 3, 51 = Rv. X, 18, 12.

---

[1] Av. XVIII, 4, 37. The qualification 'according to his kindred, evidently means that the size and excellence of the 'gṛhāṇ' depended on the number, position and means of the kinsmen of the deceased (cf. its exemplification in actual Buddhistic dedicatory structures).

[2] Av. XVIII, 4, 55. The use of 'harmya' is significant, as in early Vedic literature 'harmya' has the sense of a big establishment, with many apartments and adjuncts, and is used also of kings' residences. The motive of building a funeral 'harmya' as given above is noteworthy: it foreshadows the dedicatory buildings and parts of them in the subsequent Buddhistic age.

[3] Cf. the sense of a big structure involved in the city-name 'Rājagṛha.'

[4] Rv. VII, 89, 1.

[5] Rv. X, 18, 3=Av. XVIII, 3, 52.

[6] Av. XVIII, 3, 52=Rv. X, 18, 3; 'loga' here is usually rendered 'clod'; but it seems in the next passage to be identified with 'sthūṇā,' and 'loga' elsewhere means a pole (stuck into the bottom of the waters, in marriage ritual; vide, Kauś. 75, 14, applying Av. XIV, 1, 37-38); cf. vern. 'lagi,' a bamboo or wooden pole, chiefly used by boatmen.

[7] Av. XVIII, 3, 52=Rv. X, 18, 3. The reference to 'seats' on the pillar would indicate some sort of a capital; in this view, a 'lion-capital' would signify a memorial pillar in honour of a late king.

[8] Av. XIV, 2, 73. The phrase 'bride-beholding fathers' would be particularly appropriate if the reference were to sculptured timber pillars bearing effigies of the deceased; (for wood sculpture vide Av. XII, 3, 33); grave-posts with effigies and rude representations of face or eyes are not unknown amongst primitive races.

[9] Occasionally bodies were buried in hollowed-out 'tree-trunks ('vanaspati'), apparently a more primitive arrangement, a combined grave and a memorial pillar: Av. XVIII, 3, 70; cf. Rv. V, 78, 5; ('vṛkṣa' in Av. XVIII, 2, 25, seems to mean a regular coffin which is buried in the earth; Sāyaṇa takes 'vanaspati' also in the same sense).

---

[1] Apart from the clear instances of the use of stone for the 'śmaśānas' noted above, an earlier use of stone is rendered possible in view of Ṛgvedic references to stone-built bulwarks and forts (vide ante). The very word 'śmaśāna' (possibly from 'aśma-śayana,' according to Weber) would suggest that stone was all along the chief material in its construction; so that the origin of this special type of funeral structure would be Magadhan and non-brāhmaṇical, and when other materials are used, this would be due to brāhmaṇical adaptation of the 'śmaśāna,' characterized by opposition to use of stone and adherence to their own traditional bricks (vide ante). This view would also agree with the fact that the Śat. Brā. does not give details of the 'gṛhāṇ,' 'prajñānaṃ' and 'round' forms of the 'śmaśānas,' and that whereas the symbolism of the altar is specially brāhmaṇical, that of the 'śmaśāna' is Buddhistic.

[2] Made of 'vṛtra'=stone, acc. to comm; the timber pillars are made of 'palāsa,' 'śamī' and 'varana': Śat. Brā. XIII, 8. 4, 1; (cf. Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XXI, 3, 31, and Śat. Brā. IV, 2, 5, 15, with S.B.E 44, 437, n. 1). 'Śaṅku' being associated with a tapering form, the stone-'śaṅku' would have a gradually narrowing shaft (like an obelisk).

[3] Cf. the 4 pillars adjacent to the 'stūpa,' and later on to medieval mausoleums.

[4] Roadside pillars and gateways are referred to very much earlier in the Av. (XIV, 1, 63) where marriage processions pass along the well-made road through 2 pillars (asked not to injure the bride: hence high and heavy); an arch or 'toraṇa' is evidently implied; these pillars (sthūṇā) may well have been of bricks or stone. Cf. Av. XIV. 2, 6, "pillar standing in the way," which however might refer to a row of posts barring the road.

[5] Vide n. 3, p. 34.

[6] Cf. the royal name 'Drupada,' beside 'Daṇḍa,' 'Daṇḍa-dhāra,' etc., found in Purāṇic and Epic lists; cf. also the ancient name Tri-śaṅku.

[7] Cf. the symbolism of 'daṇḍa' and 'skambha.'

[8] The keynote of Buddhistic (and Śaiva) architecture is this 'śmaśāna' symbolism, just as the 'altar' symbolism is associated with brāhmaṇical structures: it is probable that in Taitt. Saṃ. V, 2, 8, 5 (p. 42, n. 2), these two ancient groups of symbolism are hinted at.

[9] Aśokan inscriptions refer to widely distributed pre-existing monolithic pillars. on which he ordered his edicts to be inscribed (cf. Samudragupta); vide end of Min. R. Ed. I, Rup. Text; end of Pill. Ed. VII; as opp. to fresh erection of such pillars, e.g., Rummin. Pill. Inscr.

sufficient explanation of the Aśokan pillars, and a theory of their Persepolitan origin is unnecessary.[1]

From all this it may reasonably be concluded that a stone structural style with round forms, the immediate source of the Buddhistic architecture, was early developed in non-brāhmaṇical areas, particularly in Magadha; traces of which may be discovered in the earlier Vedic literature (cir. 10th cent. B.C. at least), and which was definitely flourishing in the 7th cent. B.C.

Summing up the evidence on structural forms, it seems probable that there were three main sources from which the early and later Vedic styles, the prototypes of subsequent well-known ones, were derived: the Lower Gangetic regions (including the delta), the Deccan borderland (including Magadha), and the Middle Himālayas (with submontane areas). These regions quite naturally gave rise to building styles characterized by bamboo and brick, stone, and timber, respectively. The first is associated with Āṅgirasas, brāhmaṇism, and what may be called Mānva regions; the second with the Vrātyas and Māgadhas (Prācyas), occupying an area assigned by tradition to a stock different from the Mānvas and Ailas but with superimposed layers of Ailas; the third would be brought by the Ailas into the plains from the Mongoloid mountainous areas they passed through and came in contact with. The ethnic and historical significance of such indications in the Vedic literature cannot be over-estimated, being also in agreement with the facts of Purāṇic tradition.[2]

---

[1] It seems probable that Mauryan monolithic pillars had their origin from the indigenous toddy-palm. Magadha is thickly set with palm-groves, the prehistoric prototypes of ancient village halls with palm posts and of the Mauryan 1000-pillared halls (at first of timber). The palm leaf is of course the prehistoric material for writing in the Gangetic valley or the littoral; and the regular lines and spaces on the stem of the palm tree afford ready surface for inscriptions or public and royal orders in writing (at first with paints), this being suggested by the common use of palm leaf for writing. The palm develops a tapering monolith-like stem, crowned by a tuft of fans (some branches being often cut away for toddy) ('tāḷī'-drawing), resembling lions' manes at twilight, and thus suggesting a four-faced lion-capital, while the streaked toddy-vessel hung up aloft would suggest the so called 'bell'-capital. Probably criminals were hanged on or bound to the palm-trees by royal order (cf. the Vedic and Epic 'drupada'): 'tālī' is again 'vāruṇi,' belonging to Varuṇa, the god of justice, chastisement and kingly power; and the toddy-drawer is as much a 'Pāśī' as Varuṇa himself; his caste being so named from the use of a peculiar 'pāśa' (of palm-fibre, with the help of which he climbs up the tall slender trees); with such a 'pāśa' and by such a 'pāśī,' doubtless, the criminals of old were bound to or hanged from the palm trees (a folk tradition which seems to be responsible for various apparently unmeaning nursery rhymes about fearful spies and chastisers on palm trees, and for the 'folk-fear' that, ghosts and spirits dwell on them and fall upon persons venturing to rest under them).

Vide Pargiter AIHT, chaps XXIX. XXV and XXVI.

FURNITURE, ETC.

If references to house-building in the Vedic literature are few and fragmentary, those to the internal equipments of such structures are necessarily so. The details found in the texts are mostly connected with ritual, and it is only incidentally that some secular and ordinary feature of house-furnishing is noted. The ritualistic types of furniture, again, cannot be taken as a faithful counterpart of the contemporary secular ones, for it is well-known that sacrificial and ritual requisites almost always remain primitive and unchanged throughout long ages, and it is particularly true of India[1]; so that the ' furniture ' of the priestly texts is almost that with which the ' brāhmaṇic ' cult and civilization started.[2] So great is the ritual conservatism in these respects, that even where special circumstances required alteration in the sacrificial paraphernalia, the external items are transformed into ' brāhmaṇical '-looking accessories, by the employment of primitive materials sacred in ritual tradition.[3]

Naturally the ' furniture ' most alluded to consists of various *seats* and *beds*. These were of very different grades of comfort and structural complexity, items connected with the ritual being always much cruder. Thus, ' prastara,'[4] a sacrificial seat, consists only of strewn grass (darbha); ' barhis,'[5] for the ' seats of the gods,' is a litter of ' balbaja '[6] grass strewn on the sacrificial ground; ' kūrca '[7] is a bundle of reedy grass for a seat, or a small square grass-mat easily rolled into a bundle; even where a ' cushion-seat ' (' bṛsī', ' vṛśī,' or ' vṛṣī ')[8] is used, it is of grass.[9]

---

[1] The same materials and shapes being mostly retained.

[2] The materials employed would indicate that a good part of the Brāhmaṇic equipment was ' Gangetic,' evidently forming the original stock, which was supplemented by other acquisitions of a Himālayan and middle-country character. (It would seem as if the ritualism of the Brāhmaṇa age had inherited the traditional ' equipments ' of both the Northern Āryans and the Eastern Pre-Āryans).

[3] E.g. the ' Brāhmaṇa ' treatment of the Imperial throne, sadly reduced and metamorphosed in the ritual.

[4] Rv. X, 14, 4; Av. 2, 6; Taitt. Saṃ. I, 7, 7, 4; Vāj. Saṃ. II, 18; XVIII, 63; Ait. Brā. I, 26; II, 3; Śat. Brā. I, 3, 3, 5; etc.

[5] Quite common in Rv., Taitt. Saṃ., Vāja. Saṃ. etc.; (vide V.I. II, 61).

[6] Kāṭh. Saṃ. X, 10; Taitt. Saṃ. II, 2, 8, 2; Mait. Saṃ. II, 2, 5.

[7] Taitt. Saṃ. VII, 5, 8, 5; Śat Brā. XI, 5, 3, 4.7; Ait. Āraṇ. V, 1, 4; Bṛhad. Up. II, 11, 1.

[8] Ait. Āraṇ. 1, 2, 4; V, 1, 3; 3, 2; Śāṅkh. Śr. Sūt. XVII, 4, 7; 6, 6, Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XIII, 3, 1. The ' bṛsi ' seat, i.e. the padding of it. was a span high (Śāṅkh. Āraṇ. (Keith), viii.).

[9] Just as the sacrificer's wife wears a garment of Kuśa grass for some rites,—a relic of primitive dress (Śat. Brā. V, 2, 1, 8).

But there were other seats of a more advanced type. Thus the ‘ sadas,’ from which the ‘ sadasya ’[1] watched the performance of the sacrifice, must have been a raised seat, and of a style specially associated with his office. The ‘ kaśipu ’[2] is a mat or cushion made from reeds (‘ naḍa ’) crushed by stones, and ‘ naḍvalā ’[3] is a bed of similar stuff; and ‘ kaṭa ’[4] is a ‘ vaitasa ’ or rattan mat, made of split cane or cane-like bamboo. These were the products of regular, ancient and indigenous crafts: ‘ kāśa ’[5] was very early used for mats, etc.; and there were professional women workers in ‘ naḍa ’[6] (reeds, canes, etc.) of the swamps, or in ‘ kaṇṭakī,’[7] apparently the thorny cactus, whose fibres were used to plait mats and stuff cushions.[8] These ‘ kārī ’s evidently turned out artistic seats and carpets, as the early occurrence of ‘ hiraṇya-kaśipu ’[9] shows; the reference here is plainly to the use of ‘ gold threads and fringes ’ in the web, borders and designs of the ‘ mat ’; so also the ‘ golden kūrca ’[10] on which the King sits at the ‘ Aśvamedha,’ while the ‘ hotṛ ’ sits on another ‘ golden ’ seat (‘ kaśipu ’), is clearly the finished rich work of craftsmen, as compared with the primitive bundle of plaited grass.

It is noteworthy, however, that all[11] the ‘ seats ’ mentioned in the ritualistic texts, are made of long grass, reeds or other products of riparian lowlands, where alone the industries alluded to could have flourished[1] in that early age. A characteristically Gangetic outfit would thus seem to have been the stock with which the 'brāhmaṇ' ritualism started.

---

[1] Vide n. in S.B.E. 43, 348, *re* Śat. Brā. X, 4, 2, 19 (cf. Keith, Ait. Āraṇ. 37).

[2] Av. VI, 138, 5. It is noteworthy that in Tāmil ‘ kacci ’=reeds or stalks, and ‘ pā ’ means mat; so that ‘ kacci-pā ’ represents the original of this ‘ kaśipu ’; (cf. also ‘ kacci ’=creeper and cocoanut-shell fibres, and ‘ kaccu ’=fibre—or grass-ropes, with which cf. vern. ‘ kāchi ’).

[3] Vāja. Saṃ. XXX, 16; Taitt. Brā. III, 4, 12, 1.

[4] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 3, 12, 2; cf. Śat. Brā. XIII, 3, 1, 3.

[5] Ṛv. X, 100. 10; Taitt. Āraṇ. VI, 9, 1.

[6] Av. VI, 138, 5; ‘ naḍa ’ growing in lakes and in rainy season; Ṛv. VIII, 1, 33; Av. IV, 19, 1; (‘ naḍa ’ is frequent in Av., Yv., Brā. and Āraṇ.). Cf. note 7.

[7] Vāj. Saṃ. XXX, 8; Taitt. Brā. III, 4, 5, 1.

[8] ‘ Thorns ’ (vide V.I., I, 133) could scarcely have been made into cushions and used to plait mats. (The use of cactus fibres for weaving or similar purposes is indigenous in many isolated districts, even to-day).

[9] Av. V, 7, 10 (as an adj., used of ‘ Arāti ’ conceived of as a gorgeous woman or a courtesan, with golden mantle (drāpi), etc.); also in Taitt. Brā. III, 9, 20, 1; Ait. Brā. VII, 18, 12; Śat. Brā. XIII, 4, 3, 1. (It is not necessary to suppose another ‘ cloth of gold ’ spread over the ‘ kaśipu,’ which itself could be ‘ golden ’ in the above sense.

[10] Śat. Brā. XIII, 4, 3, 1; acc. to the comm. it was a golden stool with feet, having a ‘ kūrca ’-like pad over it (‘ pīṭhaṃ kūrcākṛti,’ which might also mean ‘ a wooden seat, carved or painted, by ‘ ālpanā,’ so as to resemble a ‘ kūrca,’ i.e., in view of suitability to ritual).

[11] Except probably the ‘ sadas ’ of the ‘ sadasya ’ (vide ante), which may have been a raised seat of some sacred wood; but the occurrence is not very early, and the 17th priest was rather

But 'beds,' 'couches for reclining,' and *other* 'seats,' which had little connection with the sacrificial ritual, are of woodwork principally. Thus the 'pīṭha' (alluded to in the mention of the 'pīṭhasarpin'[2] cripple) was evidently a wooden seat; and like its later representative 'pīḍi' (' piḍhā,' etc.),[3] it must have been a low, rectangular, polished seat (sometimes carved, and oftener painted with designs). The 'talpa' is made of 'udumbara' wood[4] (heavy and strong),[5] with four feet and four frame-pieces ('uṣyala') 'fashioned by Tvaṣṭar' (i.e. carved and moulded by skilled carpenters), and with embroidered and inlaid ('piś') 'vardhras' (straps of leather, etc.) in the middle of it.[6] The 'proṣṭha' is clearly wooden,[7] and the 'vahya' at least partly so.[8] So also the 'āsandī,' which the Vrātya chief uses, is a comfortable chair of wooden framework[9] with adjuncts of diverse other materials; and the 'āsandī' for the King in the ritual is

---

unusual; besides 'sadas' is elsewhere a 'domestic' furniture, kept in the 'agniśāla,' probably the usual seat in the hall of a dwelling-house (cf. Śat. Brā. XIV, 3, 1, 8). 'Pīṭha' (wooden) is not directly connected with ritual till the time of the Sūtras, though they are known much earlier (vide infra. and n. 10, p. 48: (an 'udumbara' stool is used in Śāṅkh. Āraṇ: (Keith: x) by the Udgātṛ in the Mahāvrata).

[1] As they flourish at the present day, in the Gangetic districts of Bihār and Bengal, where these crafts have almost become arts, with an ancient tradition.

[2] Vāja. Saṃ. XXX, 21; Taitt. Brā. III, 4, 17, 1.

[3] This is a characteristically Eastern furniture, and the linear designs painted on it (the famous 'ālpanā') are also of Eastern origin and development. (The word 'pīṭha' may be a Sanskritised pre-Āryan one). (The 'ālpanā' would explain how the surface of the King's golden 'pīṭha' (vide n. 10, p. 48) could be made to look like a seat of 'kūrca').

[4] Taitt. Brā. I, 2, 6, 5.

[5] That is the reason the Brāhmaṇas give for its employment in the King's seat 'āsandī: but it is more of a reason to connect the use of 'udumbara' for the secular 'āsandī' and 'talpa' with the fact that this wood is indigenous to the sub-Himālayan tracts. So also, other 'āsandi's (e.g. of the Bharatas) are made of 'khadira' wood, also indigenous to the same region: with this is to be compared what has been said above *re* a Middle-Himālayan 'timber' style as opposed to the primarily 'brāhmanic' 'bamboo' style.

[6] Av. XIV. 1, 60: the descr. is understood of the 'talpa' by Kauś. 76, 25, probably correctly; it does not apply very well to the bridal 'car' in the next verse (though usually taken in that way).

[7] Cf. the descriptive epithet 'proṣṭha-pāda' (a name in Jaim. Upan. Brā.). Cf. also the corr. vern. form 'paiṭhā,' a wooden bench, a broad plank resting on two legs or two vertical planks, specially used of the rowers' benches in the Gangetic river-boats.

[8] Vide infra.

[9] E.g. in Av. XV, 3, 2ff.

similar[1]; but here the woodwork, etc., seem to have been gradually replaced with or supplemented by grass, reed, or cane-work,[2] in conformity with ritual tradition.[3]

The 'beds' or 'couches' mentioned, all belong to the equipment of the inner apartments of a house, being connected with women. 'Talpa'[4] is apparently the 'nuptial' bedstead,[5] used by married pairs only, as the special use of the word in 'tālpya'[6] ('legitimate son,' being born in the nuptial bed) and 'guru-talpa,'[7] and its being made of the sacred 'udumbara,' indicates. Some women in a big house ('harmya') are described as 'proṣṭha-śaya,'[8] reclining on a 'proṣṭha,' where something like a high and broad bench may be meant, as elsewhere,[9] being distinguished from 'talpa' and 'vahya'; apparently it had strong moulded and turned legs, for 'proṣṭha-pāda' was a proper name.[10] It seems probable that such long timber seats were fixed against the walls,[11] or were combinations of a settee and a coffer; thus a coffer ('kośa') with a pillow[12] is sent along with the bride when she goes to her husband's home: such marriage-coffers evidently could be used as couch or bed[13]; and it is noteworthy that both these types of 'bed' are found in the inner apartments of the middle-Himālayan villager's dwelling-house.[14]

[1] E.g. in Ait. Brā. VIII, 5; 6; 12.

[2] E.g. in Śat. Brā. XII, 8, 3, 4ff; XIV, 1, 3, 8ff; VI, 7, 1, 12ff.

[3] "Because reed-grass is meet for sacrifice": Śat. Brā. XII, 8, 3, 4-10; XIV, 1, 3, 8ff; the process of 'brāhmaṇization' is clearly indicated by the direction in Śat. Brā. III, 3, 4, 31, where all the 'human' particulars of the 'āsandī' are forbidden to be imitated in the 'ritual' 'āsandī.'

[4] Rv. VII, 55, 8=Av. IV, 5, 3 (vide infra. for sense of 'talpa' here); Av. V, 7, 12 (king and his wife's); XIV, 2, 31.41 (bridal); Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 2, 6, 4; Taitt. Brā. II, 2, 5, 3; Pāñc. Brā. XXIII, 4, 2; XXV, 1, 10.

[5] Corresponding to the 'viyer khāṭ' of Bengal, to which a peculiar sanctity and significance is attached, and which may only be used by the married pair who first used it.

[6] Śat. Brā. XIII, 1, 6, 2.

[7] Chānd. Upan. V, 10, 9.

[8] Rv. VII, 55, 8=Av. IV, 5, 3.

[9] Taitt Brā. II, 7, 17, 1.

[10] Cf. n. 7, p. 49.

[11] So that the 'proṣṭha' having two 'pādas' only (cf. n. 7, p. 49) would afford a parallel for men's legs.

[12] Av. XIV, 1, 6.

[13] Cf. the medieval Germanic marriage-coffers (of woodwork), which are very much like the combined bed and coffer of the Himālayan houses.

[14] E.g. in the timber-built houses of the Simlā Hill States, where these are used by women-folk for naps between work, or as regular beds.

'Vahya '[1] is a couch of a comfortable kind, used by women; the name suggests a light structure, that could be carried about when necessary, so that it would seem to have been a canopied reclining arm-chair, with poles or handles for carriers.[2] But a 'vahya,' 'bearing all forms' (i.e. of carved wood-work), and with a gold-embroidered coverlet ('rukma-prastaraṇa'), is the bed on which the bride mounts and lies with her groom in the marriage-ritual.[3] This seems to be referred to in the next 'mantra' as the 'talpa' of the pair[4]; and after the consummation the 'demons' of this 'talpa '[5] are got rid of by the priest. Thus the bridal 'vahya' would be something more than a mere litter or sedan-chair,—a regular bedstead, capacious enough for two; so that 'vahya' might be taken to signify the bed carried along with the bride[6] to her new home as part of her dowry.[7] But this again is rendered uncertain by a following consummation-'mantra,' which shows that during the ceremony the couple had also lain together on an 'āsandī '[8] (settee), with cushion and coverlet[9]; this 'āsandī' cannot have been a full bed.[10] So the bridal 'vahya' need not be taken as identical with the 'talpa' mentioned in the same connection; and it would rather appear that the 'vahya,' 'talpa,' and 'āsandī,' were three essential items of furniture for the bridal chamber.[1] So also, the 'vahya' is specially associated with the bride, as shown by the incidental simile: "like a tired bride ascending the 'vahya,' "[2]—evidently referring to the above marriage ritual. Thus the apparently obscure distinctions made in Rv. VII, 55, 8, become clear: it refers to married women occupying their commodious 'talpas,' the new bride (or prospective brides, one of whom is sought to be approached secretly) on the fashionable 'vahya,' and other single women of the household on the sterner 'proṣṭhas,' within the 'harmya' or big family-home. 'Sayana'[3] is a general term for bed or couch, with no particular features, except softness and association with women.

---

[1] Rv. VII, 55, 8 = Av. IV, 5, 3 (women sleeping on it); Av. **IV, 20, 3** (weary bride mounting it); XIV, 2, 30 (used in **marriage** ceremony).

[2] Something like the modern 'ḍāṇḍi' of the lower Himālayas or 'ḍuli' of the plains, also used by women mostly.

[3] Av. XIV, 2, 30.

[4] Av. XIV, 2, 31.

[5] Av. XIV, 2, 41.

[6] It would of course be something distinct from the "'kośa' and pillow" similarly sent with her (see above).

[7] Cf. the same custom nowadays. (For 'vah' in the sense of 'bringing dowry, etc., along with one,' cf. a King's wife called 'Śatavāhī': Av. V, 17, 11.

[8] Av. XLV, 2, 65.

[9] Or the 'upadhāna' and 'upavāsana' might refer to the already used 'talpa' and covered 'vahya' respectively (vide ante); 'upavāsana' might also refer to the dress of the bride herself. In any case, the 'vahya,' 'talpa' and 'āsandī' are all used by the couple.

[10] Elsewhere in Av. and in Ait. and Śat. Brās., 'āsandi' is a throne or throne-like seat (vide infra); but once in Śat. Brā. (vide infra) and in Buddhist texts (cf. Dīgha Nikāya, II, 23) it is said to be carried by 4 men (implying a longish reclining chair); and 'āsandiā' in Hāla is later on glossed by 'paryaṅkikā' and 'khaṭvā,' * pointing to a long couch; but in earlier literature 'āsandī' is definitely a 'seat,' and it is rather the 'vahya' which corresponds to a 'long reclining couch.'

* (Quoted in Whitney and Lanman, Trans. Av.); the 'paryaṅkikā' is comparable to the 'pratiśayyikā' of Vāts. Kā. Sūt.; 'khaṭvā' is a light, narrow, cord-or strap-woven bed.

A number of details are given about the 'āsandī' (and the 'paryaṅka'): apparently because furniture of this type was not common in the ordinary priest's dwelling-house, and originated with the ruling nobility,[4] though in their ritualized and modified form (reed-covered and clay-daubed),[5] these must have been subsequently used by brāhmaṇs also.[6]

'Āsandī,' literally,[7] is a generic term for seat of some fine sort, but from its first mention onwards, a special type[1] of seat is almost always implied by it; the type varies in different references, but the earlier and more usual form[2] is something like a comfortable 'gadi' (equivalent to a throne), that might be used by the ruling aristocracy or on special occasions by other people; a secondary and modified form[3] is that adopted in ritual, where a king is concerned, or where a deity is conceived of as a king; still later is the form more or less approaching a bed, referred to in Pāli and early Prākṛt literature.[4]

---

[1] Another item would be the 'kośa' and pillow brought by the bride; the red ox-hide spread over strewn 'baḷbaja' (rush), on which the bride sits, is part of the *ritual* requisites (Av. XIV, 2, 22-24).

[2] Av. IV, 20, 3.

[3] Av. III, 25, 1 (of a beloved woman, a maiden; 'ut-tuda' is an unexplained word in this verse; can it mean 'silk' or 'silken coverlet' of the maiden's 'śayana,'—from 'tuda' = mulberry leaves (i.e., sprung from 'tuda')? The meaning would then be, "let the silken coverlet on thy bed, pain ('tud') thee," etc., 'involving a pun on tuda'). Also Śat Brā. XI, 5. 1, 2 (Purūravas and Urvaśī's couch); ibid. 7, 4 (soft couch of a Vedic student); Av. V, 29, 8.

[4] Thus the 'āsandī is called the 'navel' and 'womb' of 'rājanyas,' and is always specially characteristic of the ruling chief. (Even to-day 'pālaṅg' (or 'pālaṅka') is more aristocratic than 'khāṭ' ('khaṭvā').

[5] Vide infra.

[6] Thus, such a seat, with cushion, is prescribed as 'fee' after funeral rites: Sat. Brā. XIII, 8, 4, 10.

[7] 'Āsandī' should properly mean either a 'brilliant seated person' or a 'shining seat,' *i.e.*, a throne as well as an enthroned prince (this sense is perhaps also implied in the name of the Kuru capital 'Āsandī-vant'; vide ante). 'Dī' in 'āsandi' is indicative of lustre or prominence; or perhaps 'andī' may be an early Sanskritic suffix indicative of prominent and ever-present features; cf. words similarly formed: 'vāsandī' (domiciled), corrupted into colloq. vern. 'vāsunde'; 'bhūṣaṇḍī' (gaudily, uncouthly dressed', corr. into colloq. vern. bhusuṇḍī'; 'kalandi' (rippling), changed into 'kālindī,' a river name. It seems likely that Asandhimitṛā, q. of Aśoka, was so designated being 'mitrā' or consort on the 'āsandī' or throne,—'Āsandi-mitrā' being the regal title.

The 'āsandī' is first referred to in Av., and in connection with the inauguration of 'the Vrātya' for whom it is brought together[5]; and as the origin of royalty is there ascribed to this idealized event,[6] it would appear that the Atharvanic tradition regarded the first kings as 'Vrātyas' (in all likelihood Easterners)[7] and the 'āsandī' as the royal seat specially associated with them.[7] It is to be noted here that 'āsandī' does not occur in Rv.,[8] though allusions to things 'regal' are not altogether wanting in it; the force of this point, however, is weakened by the references in the Brāhmaṇas to an 'āsandī' "like those of the Bharatas,"[9] a 'Ṛgvedic' midland dynasty, and to an older 'gāthā' mentioning 'Āsandīvant,' the capital of Janamejaya-Pārikṣita I of the same race.[10] Thus the

---

[1] This comes out clearly from the comparative summary of descriptions given infra.

[2] From Av. onwards.

[3] Particularly in the Brāhmaṇas.

[4] Vide n. 10, p. 51. (The 'āsandi' probably was displaced by the subsequent 'paryaṅka' (vide infra) and the 'siṃhāsana'; it is not referred to after the 1st century A.D.; it is possible that the latter correctly represents the earlier 'āsandī' which was a 'vyāghrāsana' (with tiger-skin spread neck in front): i.e., the Eastern and Gangetic style of 'throne' was modified by contact with West Indian conditions, the 'tiger' symbolism being replaced by a 'lion' one; vide next para. and notes 9 and 10 below).

[5] Av. XV, 3, 2ff.

[6] The emphatic view of the Av. about the 'vrātya' origin of kingship and priesthood, and the great political power and prestige of the 'vrātya,' finds complete support from the Purāṇic tradition regarding them, and seems to be only a priestly and mystic version of accepted and known facts of that tradition: the 'vrātyas' corresponding to the non-Ailas. The 'vrātya' hymns can be much better explained by this reasonable hypothesis, than by supposing that the 'vrātya' is a wandering 'sādhu' or a pretentious 'śaiva' mendicant, or a personification of Brahman.

[7] See n. 6 above.

[8] But 'upavarhaṇa' (and °ṇī) and 'upastaraṇa' are known to Rv., and these were particularly connected with 'āsandī'; cf. Rv. X, 85, 7; IX, 69, 5.

[9] Sat. Brā. V. 4, 4, 1ff. The Bharatas were however much influenced by the Angirasas, acc. to Pur°. tradition.

[10] Ait. Brā. VIII, 21. This king is placed by Purāṇic tradition about 20 steps before the close of the Ṛgvedic period.

'vrātya' (Eastern) emblem of royalty (as known to the Aṅgirasas) would appear to have early been adopted by Midland rulers also. The same original connection with Atharvanic tradition is probably indicated by the use of the 'āsandī' in the Av. marriage-ceremonial,[1] and its absence in that of the Rv.

The 'paryaṅka' is a later development, being first mentioned and described in the later Vedic texts[2]; it is a magnified 'āsandī,' and like it associated with regal style and opulence, rather approaching a bedstead, but yet used for sitting only; so also, later on, 'āsandiā' is taken to mean 'paryaṅkikā,' a smaller 'paryaṅka.'[3]

The general type of these 'high class' seats comes out sufficiently clearly from a comparative summary of descriptions in the texts: (i) In Av.: (a)[4] The Vrātya chief's 'āsandī': framework of wood and cording or straps; 2 (fore) feet, 2 (back) feet[5]; 2 lengthwise and 2 crosswise pieces, forward and cross 'tantu's (rather 'woven' straps, than 'cords'); and 'upaśraya,' the support or back of the seat; adjuncts: 'āstaraṇa,' coverlet; 'āsāda,' seat proper (i.e. the cushion for sitting on); and 'upavarhaṇa,' cushion for leaning against. (b)[6] The bridal 'āsandī': the framework is not described; it may have been a bed-like reclining couch,[7] but the supposition is not essential[8]; adjuncts: not clearly defined; the 'upadhāna' (pillow), and 'upavāsana' (covering cloth) may or may not belong to it.[9]

(ii) In Yv. Saṃhitās[10]: though often mentioned, descriptions are rare[11]; here also, the 'āsandī' is specially associated with kingship or imperial rank,[12] and secondarily with gods,[1] while its use in ritual by a sacrificing priest[2] ensures 'sāmrājya' for his client; but elsewhere the qualificatory term 'rājāsandī'[3] shows that humbler 'āsandī's' were in use amongst other people at the same time.

---

[1] Av. XIV, 2, 65. The Ṛgvedic marriage ceremonial (in its last book) is only a 'selection' from the Atharvavedic one, which must be very much older and traditional.

[2] Kauṣ. Upan. I, 5. Cf. Jaim. Brā. II, 24; and Śāṅkh. Āraṇ. iii.

[3] Vide n. 10, p. 51.

[4] Av. XV, 3, 2 ff.

[5] This distinguishing of feet probably points to a rectangular frame.

[6] Av. XIV, 2, 65.

[7] So as to suit the marriage ritual better.

[8] Thus, the use of capacious 'throne-seats' for the newly married pair in Indian ceremonial is traditional.

[9] Vide n. 9, p. 51.

[10] Taitt. Saṃ. VII, 5, 8, 5; Vāja. Saṃ. VIII, 56; XIX, 16; 86; etc.

[11] Skin cover and smooth and pleasant seat: Taitt. Saṃ. I, 8, 16.

[12] E.g. Vāja. Saṃ XIX, 86, where the 'āsandī' is regarded as a 'mother,' i.e. the 'womb of rājanyas' (as elsewhere, e.g. Vāja. Saṃ. XX, 1).

(iii) In the Brāhmaṇas: (a) In the Aitareya: the King's 'āsandī' adapted for use at consecration and other 'regal' ceremonials :—(*a*)[4] Quite a small seat (evidently for temporary use during ritual); framework of 'udumbara' wood; the feet a span high; the 'head-' and cross-pieces each a cubit (i.e., a 'square' type)[5]; the interwoven part ('vivayana') of plaited 'muñja' reed; adjunct: 'āstaraṇa,' spread, being a tiger-skin, placed neck in front (so that the long skin would cover both the (śīrṣaṇya' and the seat proper). (*b*)[6] Framework the same (of 'udumbara' and with 'śīrṣaṇya'); but the specification of front feet and back feet shows a 'rectangular' type (with probably differently moulded pairs of legs); and the lengthwise cords and cross-ties are apparently run through holes[7] in the frame-pieces; adjunct: 'upavarhaṇa,' back cushion. (*c*)[8] Another description: same framework and other details, as in (*b*). (*b*) In the Śatapatha: (*a*)[9] 'Āsandī' "like that of the Bharatas," and specially a 'rājanya' seat (being the 'womb' of that class):—a high seat above the level of low seats of surrounding subjects; made of khadira' wood, perforated ('vitṛṇṇā), and joined with straps (' vardhra '), pleasant and soft-seated, and placed on a tiger-skin. (*b*)[1] The ' imperial ' and ' kṣatra ' ' āsandī ' adapted for sacrificial ritual: made of ' udumbara ' wood; knee high; of great width and depth; covered with plaited reedwork, because reed-grass is meet for sacrifice, and for the same reason, the ' spread ' is a black antelope-skin.[2] (*c*)[3] ' Āsandī ' of the ' samrāj,' similarly adapted: of ' udumbara,' and shoulder-high (as compared with the rājā's navel-high ' āsandī ')[4]; wound all over with cords of rush (' balbaja ') owing to ritual mystic significance. (*d*)[5] ' Āsandī ' used in pure *sacrificial* rites: of ' udumbara '; a span high; a cubit in width and depth (i.e. of a '*square* ' type); covered with reed-grass cords, and daubed with *clay* as well. (*e*)[6] ' Āsandī,' said to be also called ' ṛta-sadanī ' (throne of justice), ascribed to a deity in ritual: of ' udumbara '; navel-high; to be taken up by 4 men, instead of 2 who ordinarily take up the King's ' āsandī,' many details of which are explicitly stated to have been dropped or modified, as " human elements are to be eschewed as far as possible in sacrifices."

---

[1] E.g. Vāja. Saṃ VIII, 56, the seat of Varuṇa (conceived of usually as a great King).

[2] Taitt. Saṃ. VII, 5, 8, 5. Two other seats are used at the same time, the 'kūrca' and the 'pleṅkhā,' which last can hardly have been an ordinary 'swing.' (In the Mahāvrata ceremonial (as in Śāṅkh. Āraṇ.), the 'swing' is set up on timber-posts no doubt, but is used only as a 'seat'). The comm. gives 'dolā' as its meaning; in vern. 'dolā' is the same as 'ḍulī,' a sort of carrying chair, which does swing; 'dolā' and 'ḍulī' are used indifferently in Bengali. The sense of a 'rocking chair' is however admissible. The comm. here glosses 'āsandi' by 'khaṭvākārā,' 4-legged, and high.

[3] Vāja. Saṃ. XIX, 16.

[4] Ait. Brā. VIII, 5 and 6. (The seat is mounted with the right knee first, then the left, approaching from behind and taking hold of it by both hands).

[5] Cf. the modern 'khāṭlī' or 'cārpāi' of Upper India, characterized by the same span and cubit measurements and square type, with 4 moulded and painted legs, and the 'seat' of stretched woven straps.

[6] Ait. Brā. VIII, 12.

[7] This shows acquaintance with cane-woven seats; thus there were two main types of 'seats' in these 'āsandīs,' with cane (or equivalent) run and woven through holes in frames, or broad strap (leathern or woven stuff) wound over and across the frames.

[8] Ait. Brā. VIII, 17.

[9] Śat. Brā. V, 4, 4, 1ff.

(iv) In Śāṅkh. Āraṇ. and Kauṣ. Upan.[7]: (a) Brahman's ' far-shining ' ' āsandī ' (in an extensive *hall*, of an invincible *abode*, in a *city*) : 2 fore feet, 2 hind feet, 2 lengthwise and 2 cross pieces. This is evidently regarded as a smaller and minor seat beside the ' paryaṅka ' next described. (b) ' Paryaṅka ' of ' unmeasured splendour ': same arrangement of feet and frame, and straps (' tantu ') stretched lengthwise and crosswise; with ' śīrṣaṇya ' (' head-piece ' of the couch), ' upaśrī ' (the supporting ' back ' of the couch), ' upavarhaṇa ' and ' uc-chīrṣaka ' (cushion and pillow for the head); thereon ' Brahman ' ***sits***.

---

[1] Śat. Brā. XII, 8, 3, 4-10.
[2] Cf. ' āsandī ' of ' udumbara ' with spread of goat-skin: Śat. Brā. V, 2, 1, 22.
[3] Śat. Brā. XIV, 1, 3, 8 ff.
[4] Śat. Brā. III, 3, 4, 26 ff.
[5] Śat. Brā. VI, 7, 1, 12 ff.
[6] Śat. Brā. III, 3, 4, 26 ff.
[7] Kauṣ. Upan. I, 5; Śāṅkh. Āraṇ. III; (cf. Jaim. Brā. II, 24).

DRESS AND COSTUMES.

Though the Vedic references to the materials and manners of dressing, etc., are few, yet incidentally they throw much side light on contemporary social conditions. Thus a quite evident feature is a considerable variety in these materials and manners, which can only have developed with different regional conditions and tribal customs and tastes: so that any general reconstruction of one typical Vedic or Indo-Āryan dress, etc., from those references, would be more imaginary than scientific.

Skins form one class of 'Vedic' clothing material. The Maruts are dressed in deer-skins,[1] and the gods alarm the enemies with coats or shields of such skins ('hariṇasyâ-jinena')[2]; 'muni's wear brown and tanned skins ('piśaṅgā malā')[3]; and skins of black antelopes are in common and traditional ritual use in the Av. and Yv.[4] It is noteworthy that none but 'gods' and brāhmaṇs use skins: the only exceptions being the Vrātya chieftains and their followers, who have an improved style of wearing twofold ('dvisaṃhitāni') 'ajina's, one black and one white ('kṛṣṇa-valakṣa'), so as to form fur-lined skin-wraps,[5] and the aboriginal forest tribes (evidently Kolārian) who wore 'kṛtti's (and 'dūrśa') at dances,[6] and used 'ajina's.[7] Again, it is the goatskin ('ajina') that is primarily and mainly used (all other skins being called 'ajina'),—other varieties[8] being the skins of the 'kṛṣṇa' (black antelope) and the 'hariṇa' and 'eta' (spotted deer); but no sheep-skins, camel-skins, etc., are mentioned as worn or otherwise used.[9] On the other hand,

---

[1] Rv. I, 166, 10; of the 'eta' or spotted deer, hung from the shoulders.

[2] Av. V, 21, 7.

[3] Rv. X, 136, 2. Cf. the brāhmaṇ priest going clad in 'ajina' (goat-skin) according to ritual custom, Śat. Brā. III, 9, 1, 12. (*Re* tanning, in Rv. and later, vide V.I., I, 257; *re* the furrier's trade: cf. Vāja. Saṃ. XXX, 15; Taitt. Brā. III, 2, 13, 1; the skins worn must have been properly dressed).

[4] Vide V.I., I, 185; and of goatskins: cf. Śat. Brā. III, 9, 1, 12; V, 2, 1, 21.24 (ajarṣabhasya ajinaṃ).

[5] Pañc. Brā. XVII, 1-15; cf. Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XII, 1; XXII, 4; Lāṭ. Śr. Sūt. VIII, 6; Āpast. Śr. Sūt. XXII, 5, 4-14.

[6] Av. VIII, 6, 11.

[7] Av. IV, 7, 6.

[8] For other purposes the skins of boars (and antelopes) were used for shoes, and of tigers for seat-spreads; rhinoceros hides for chariots; red cow-hides for ritual seats and war-drums.

[9] Śat. Brā. III, 1, 2, 13 ff. may point to a tradition of wearing cow-hides in primitive ages; 'āvika' in Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XXII, 4, seems to mean sheep-skin, but it is evidently a late addition of Sūtra period, not being found in the corresponding older passage in Pañc. Brā. XVII, 14-16.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

the texts know of the primitive riparian clothing material of grass: the 'kuśa' skirt (round hips only) which the sacrificer's wife has to wear over her ordinary dress,[1] is evidently a relic of the prehistoric grass garment; with this may be compared the common ritual use of grass girdles, 'śāṇī' or 'mauñjī,' first invented by Āṅgirasas.[2] These facts can only signify that this specially brāhmaṇical and ritual, Vrātya and aboriginal, use of certain varieties of skins and grass-reeds as clothing, arose in the Eastern Gangetic country amongst early indigenous peoples,[3] and is not part of any extra-Indian North-Western outfit that Āryan immigrants from Central Asia might be supposed to have brought with them.

Another material for clothing was wool (ūrṇā). The late occurrence of 'āvika,'[4] sheep's wool, shows that the first source of wool in Vedic India was the goat, just as the first skins worn were goat-skins[5]; 'ūrṇā,' also, primarily means 'hairy covering' of any animal,[6] though the 'ūrṇā' of the Paruṣṇī, etc., must refer to sheep's wool.[7] So also, there is little indication of the divine or traditional use, or ritual sanctity, of sheep's wool (or indeed of any wool): where Pūṣan is called a 'vāso-vāya' weaving 'sheep's cloth,'[8] the obvious implication is that the ordinary and traditional weaver's product was not such 'sheep's cloth' but cloth of other materials, and that it is therefore no reference to the antiquity of woollens, but rather a glorification of the wool-grower's activities beside those of the traditional 'cloth-weaver'; where, again, the Maruts are said to tarry on the Paruṣṇī, putting on purified (dyed or bleached) woollens,[9] it is a plain compliment paid to a contemporary flourishing Punjāb wool industry that may have struck the fancy of the poet; the 'soma'-strainer is woollen, but it may well have been originally of goat-hair; the 'pāṇḍva,' worn by kings (kṣatras)

---

[1] Śat. Brā. V, 2, 1, 8.

[2] Cf. Śat. Brā. III, 2, 1, 10-11 (mekhalā' of 'śāṇi,' of three cords intertwined with 'muñja,' plaited like hair, and as soft as 'ūrṇā').

[3] For all the animals concerned belong to East North-India, particularly the lower Gangetic provinces: while sheep-skins, etc., are specially North-Western; the Vrātyas and the aborigines referred to are clearly Magadhan from the context; brāhmaṇ ritualism (which is mainly Āṅgirasa) is itself originally Gangetic, as we have seen elsewhere.

[4] Bṛhad. Upan. II, 3, 6; 'āvika' in Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XXII, 4, means sheepskins, apparently a much later substitute or alternative to the 'ajina' of the corresponding older passage in Pañc. Brā. XVII, 14-16.

[5] Vide ante.

[6] Cf. spider's web and human hair so called. The primary sense of covering has survived in modern 'orṇā' veil, and 'uruṇi,' scarf, both of cotton or silk.

[7] For those regions were pre-eminently suited for sheep-pastures.

[8] Rv. X, 26, 6.

[9] Rv. V, 52, 9.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

at sacrifices[1] may be simply an unbleached or dyed cotton or silken stuff,[2] and not a woollen garment at all. The use of sheep's wool, then, was not prehistoric, and was almost wholly secular, 'as covering (second skin) for men and their beasts.'[3] Even so, it does not seem to have been in general use. In the Av., 'kambala's (blankets)[4] and 'śāmulya's[5] (undergarments of wool ?) are part of the ordinary domestic outfit of men and women; but the 'śāmulya' may have been of 'silk-cotton wool,'[6] and the 'kambala' of other animal fur or hair as well.[7] All the more direct references to sheep-farming and woollens pertain to the North-Western corner of India only,[8] where evidently it was the staple industry and a monopoly. Thus the Indus region was 'suvāsā ūrṇāvatī,' 'woolly' and producing fine clothing stuff[9]; the softest wool was of the ewes of the Gāndhārans[10]; Paruṣṇī, also, was 'woolly' and produced bleached or dyed woollens ('śundhyavaḥ).[11]' It is to be noted that while Paruṣṇī wool is mentioned in comparatively earlier passages, those mentioning Sindhu and Gāndhāra wool (further west) are later.

---

[1] Śat. Brā. V, 3, 5, 21. Mait. Saṃ. IV, 4, 3. (pāṇḍaraṃ).

[2] Probably 'gairika' or 'geruā,' of later times, just as the 'tārpya mentioned in the same connection seems to represent the 'tasar' sacred to ritual; or it may represent the later 'garad' which is pale cream coloured, and goes together with 'tasar.'

[3] Vāja. Saṃ. XIII, 50.

[4] Av. XIV, 2, 66.67.

[5] Rv. X, 85, 29=Av. XIV, 1, 25.

[6] Or 'śālmalīya': *i.e.* vests, robes, or wrapper, of light cotton padding (like what are ordinarily used even now); probably 'śāmulya' refers only to a light quilt of cotton-wool, used in the bridal bed (cf. the 'kambala' of the bride-wooers). 'Ś (S) āmula' occurs elsewhere also: Jaim. Upan. Brā. I, 38, 4; Lāṭ. Śr. Sūt. IX, 4, 7; Kauś. Sūt. LXIX, 3. In the mod. Tāmil 'semmaṛi' =ewe, is probably the original of 'śālmalī' to be recognised; cf. Tāmil 'simbuḷi'=rough cloth, with which cf. the vern. form 's(ś)imul(a).' Vern. 'śāmlā' is a kind of narrow shawl (for tying round the head or waist); it also means the embroidered end of a turban or 'kamarband,' tucked or hanging in folds; the word is usually derived from Arabic 'shamlat,' from a root=to include; but more probably it is an Urduised form of the indigenous 'śamūla,' which would seem to be the original of the famous 'shawl'; cf. the variant Vedic form, 'śābalya.'

[7] E.g. of goats and bears (it is curious that in vern. proverbs and folk-lore the 'kambala' is made of 'loma,' hair, and is identified with bear-skin. Cf. Tāmil, 'kamb (p) aḷi'=rough hair-cloth; also 'simbuḷi'; and 'kuṛumbādu'=hairy, fleecy. Cf. the Rv. form 'siṃbalam' for 'śālmalī': Rv. III, 54, 22).

[8] Industrial traditions are remarkably persistent in India: even now, Peshāwār and Kābul, Ludhiānā, Dhāriwāl, Amritsar, Lāhore, carry on the traditions with their typical woollen manufactures, of the Paruṣṇī-Gāndhāra area.

Rv. X, 75, 8.

Rv. I, 126, 7.

[11] Rv. IV, 22, 2; V, 52, 9; the river was so named from being in a wool district.

All these Vedic facts regarding wool become fully intelligible when referred to some of the main facts of traditional history[1]: this knows of no Āryan expansion eastwards from Afghanistan, but, according to it, the Ailas (and some Mānvas)[2] progressed from East to West, from the Gangetic country to the Punjāb and beyond, in gradual and well-marked stages; hence there is no indication of an ancient use of sheepskin or sheep's wool in the Vedic texts; as the Punjāb came to be colonized, a specialized wool industry naturally developed; but there is no mention of sheepskins, for the skin-wearing stage had long been left behind, and the traditional vāso-vāya's craft was simply transferred from one material to another[3]; thus, again, the Paruṣṇī wool came to be known first to interior India, and then the Indus and Gāndhāra products; the nature of the complimentary references in the above passages also becomes clear: a Midland ṛṣi aptly apprehends that the attractions of the flourishing wool-district of the Paruṣṇī may have detained his gods; the high-flown praise of the Indus with its wool manufactures (to the exclusion of other rivers and their products) best suits a ṛṣi from the old country of Madhyadeśa in ecstasies over his visit to the younger and developing Punjāb settlements; and the simile drawn from Gāndhāra ewes betrays a non-Gāndhāran appreciation of their soft fleeces.

Silk is more common in Vedic ritual use than woollens. Thus the 'vāsas' of 'tārpya,'[4] some sort of silk,[5] with which a dead body is clothed in order that the departed may go about properly dressed in Yama's realm,[6] was evidently an ancient traditional item of clothing; 'kṣauma,' another variety of silk, is found early and often in ritual use[7]; and even saffron-coloured silken garments ('kausumbha-paridhāna')[1] were sacred. This comparative position of silk further explains and supports what has been said above. So also, garments made of bark (so frequent in later literature) are very rarely mentioned in Vedic texts: and such and similar use of bark is more or less characteristic of the N. W. Himālayas; probably the 'barāsi'[2] of Kāṭh. Saṃ. was a barken stuff.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Pargiter: AIHT. chap. XXV.

[2] The Dhārṣṭas and Nāriṣyanta Śakas were the first to settle in the Punjāb; after them came the Ailas, in two main groups, Druhyus and Ānavas.

[3] Just as timber and bamboo styles of architecture were gradually transferred to stone.

[4] Av. XVIII, 4, 31; Taitt. Sam. II, 4, 11, 6; Mait. Sam. IV, 4, 3; Taitt. Brā. I, 3, 7, 1; 7, 6, 4; Śat. Brā. V, 3, 5, 20 (worn by kings at sacrifices; the 'rūpāṇi nisyūtāni' on it show that it was something like mod. 'kaśīdā' work on 'tasar.'

[5] Most probably the sacred 'tasar,' a rough silk, the traditional product of E. Bihār. If the comm. has any basis for its explanation, 'made from Tṛpa or Triparṇā leaves.' these would refer to mulberry or other leaves suitable for silk-cocoons. (A variety of 'tasar' (prob. = Chin. 'tsau' and Burm. 'tsa') produced in Bengal and Bihār is called 'jārvo' or 'jāru'; the habitat of 'tasar' is N.E. Deccan continued into Bengal and Bihār, and its hereditary growers are the Sāntāls, with whom it is a superstition and of religious and mystic significance; cf. Watt: Comm. Prod. of Ind., p. 1003 ff.)

[6] Av. XVIII, 4, 31.

[7] Mait. Saṃ. III, 6, 7; Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 1, 1, 3; etc.; also in Sūtras.

References to weaving are very common from the Rv. onwards; 'vāya,' weaver, occurs often in Rv., as also various uses of the root 'vā.'[4] The special term 'vāso-vāya'[5] shows that other 'vāyas' had already arisen, who produced sundry piece-goods, other than the standard 'vāsas' or wearing cloth[6]; besides, there were the female weavers, 'vayitrī's[7] and 'sirī's,[8] from very early times.[9] Technical terms connected with weaving,—like 'otu' (woof, web),[10] 'tantu' (yarn, threads or other filaments),[11] 'tantra' (warp, or loom),[12] 'prācīnâtāna' (forward-stretched web),[13]—are already of frequent application in the Vedic texts; the 'veman' (loom) and 'mayūkha' (peg, lead-weight, or shuttle)[1] are mentioned early in simile; and the different parts of the 'vāsas' are described[2] in a manner that shows that it is the well-known cotton 'dhūti,' and presupposes a fully developed and long established indigenous cotton-industry, with which the Vedic priesthood was quite familiar. It is to be noted that none of these and other terms, connected with 'vāsas' and weaving, refer to woollen or other manufactures; where silks are intended, their specific names are given, like 'tārpya' or 'kṣauma'[3]; and similarly woollens are distinguished as 'vāsas,' derived from 'avi's or 'ūrnā.' Thus the frequently used[4] general terms, 'vāsas,' 'vasana,' 'vastra,' etc., with all their manifold parts and appliances for production so often detailed, can only refer to the Gangetic cotton manufactures, probably a prehistoric craft, with which the Vedic or Brāhmanic civilization began. Accordingly we find the 'vāsas' being called sacred and divine in every part of it, in the ritualistic texts.[5]

---

[1] Sāṅkh. Āraṇ. XI, 4.

[2] Kāṭh. Saṃ. XV, 4; Pañc. Brā. XVIII, 9, 6; XXI, 3, 4; the Kāṭhakas were North-Western and sub-Himālayan; in these regions the Barās tree (a red-flowered rhododendron) is still fabled to yield cloths.

[3] Or is 'barāsī' after all a variety of cotton? cf. 'bairāti' as such a variety known to Dacca weavers (vide Watt: Comm. Prod. of Ind., s.v. Cotton).

[4] Vide V.I., s.v. 'vāya' and 'otu.'

[5] Vide ante.

[6] This distinction corresponds fairly with the later one bet. 'tāñti' and 'jolā' in Bengal and Bihār: the former being 'vāso-vāya's only, the latter producing napkins, covers, upholstering stuff, etc. (Q.—Is 'jolā' conn. with Tāmil 'jabali'=cloth? 'j(jh)abli' in several vern. means 'shabby clothes or rags.' Probably the Vedic names Jābāla and Jabālā mean "of a weaver ('jolā') family", and perhaps place-names like Jabalpur or Jabli originally signified "weaver settlement").

[7] Pañc. Brā. I, 8, 9; cf. Sat. Brā., III, 1, 2. 13ff.

[8] Rv. X, 71, 9.

[9] 'Sirī' is probably pre-Āryan; it is clearly connected with Tāmil 'silai'=cloth; in E. Verns., all work with woven stuff is designated 'sirī,' 'sili,' 'silai' or 'si(e)lāi.' Cf. also Tāmil 'sārigai,' embroidered fringe, which is probably connected with vern. 'sāri.' Probably the 'siri- āmmā' of Buddhist sculpture is the presiding genius of household weaving and handiworks ('patnis' wove or embroidered cloths for their husbands: cf. Av. XIV, 21, 51), hence of domestic prosperity,—the original of the classical 'Srī' (known from Sat. Brā. onwards.)

[10] Rv. VI, 9, 2.3; Av. XIV, 2. 51; Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 1, 1, 4; etc.

[11] Av. XIV, 2, 51; cf. XV, 3, 6 (prob.='gut'); Sat. Brā. III, 1, 2, 18; Rv. X, 134, 5 (plant filaments).

[12] Rv. X, 71, 9; etc.

[13] Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 1, 1, 4; etc.

The 'vāsas' known to the average priest is practically of the same type in the several Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas; and its descriptions would apply equally to the modern hand-loom products of Bengal. Apart from its obvious analysis into threads constituting warp and woof ('otavaḥ' and 'tantavaḥ,'[6] or 'otavaḥ' and 'prācīnatāna,'[7] or 'paryāsa' and 'anuchāda'[8]), it had borders and fringes and ornamental embroideries, for which a number of technical terms are given, showing the same variety and importance of these in Vedic as in later times. Thus 'sic' is a general term[9] for the sewn on or embroidered border or fringe (corresponding to modern 'pār' and 'āñclā'); two such are sometimes specified,[1] showing the same old style of having two lengthwise and two breadthwise borders (the latter being the 'āñclā's) of the same design for each pair; where the child is covered by its mother's 'sic,'[2] where a deer-horn is tied in the sacrificer's 'sic,'[3] or where the horizons at sunrise and sunset are said to be the two 'sicau'[4] of the sky-cloth, it is the breadthwise broader border: elsewhere it is the lengthwise narrower one, or all the borders.[5] This wider border (corresponding to the 'āñclā') is specially designated the 'nīvi,'[6] the closely woven end of the cloth,—from which depends the 'praghāta' (or 'the strikers'),[6] the loose and long unwoven fringe with swaying tassels[7]; the 'vāsas' had only one 'nīvi' usually, as now, the other end of the cloth being much plainer[8]: to this plainer end would belong the 'tūṣa'[9] (or 'the chaffs'), a shorter fringe (corresponding to modern 'chilā' or 'chilkā,'—'chaffs'). The 'vātapāna,'[10] mentioned in two passages descriptive of the 'vāsas' as *part* of it, obviously cannot mean 'a garment to protect against winds': it is rather that part of the cloth which protects *it* against winds, i.e., its lengthwise borders,[11] which keep the web together from becoming threadbare by fluttering in the wind (specially during movements). The 'ārokāḥ'[12] (or 'the brilliants') seem to have been flowers, stars or other spotty patterns[13] embroidered all over the cloth (corresponding to modern 'phul,' 'buṭā,' etc.).

---

[1] Vāja. Śam. XIX, 80; 83 (intermingling of liquors like shuttle through the loom). Mayūkha = Māku (shuttle) of the Bengal weavers.

[2] E.g. Rv. I, 95, 7; Av. XIV, 2, 51; Taitt. Sam. VI, 1, 1, 3ff; Kāṭh. Śam. XXIII, 1; Śat. Brā. III, 1, 2, 13-18; etc.

[3] Probably 'uttuda,' in Av. III, 25, 1, means "sprung from 'tuda' or mulberry," i.e. 'silken' (coverlet).

[4] 'Vāsas': Rv. I, 34, 1; 115, 4; VIII, 3, 24; X, 102, 2; etc.; Taitt. Sam. VI, 1, 9, 7; 11, 2; Vāja. Saṃ. II, 32; XI, 40; Ait. Brā. I, 3; etc.;—'vasana': Rv. I, 95, 7; Chānd. Upan. VIII, 8, 5; Kauṣ. Upan. II, 15;—'vastra': Rv. I, 26, 1; 134, 4; III, 39, 2; IV, 38, 5; V, 29, 15; etc.; Av. V, 1, 3; IX, 5, 25; XII, 3, 21; etc.

[5] E.g. Taitt. Sam. VI, 1, 1, 3ff.

[6] E.g. in Av. XIV, 2, 51; cf. 1, 45; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXIII, 1.

[7] E.g. in Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 1, 1, 3ff.

[8] E.g. in Śat. Brā. III, 1, 2, 13ff.

[9] Probably 'himyā' in Rv. I, 34, 1, is another such name for borders or fringes of a cloth which are inseparable from it, or from one another (vāsasaḥ himyeva); if 'himyā' may be derived from 'han' (cf. Sāyaṇa), it can be compared with 'praghāta'; also 'daśā' a somewhat later term for these: e.g. in Śat Brā. III, 3, 2, 9; strainers with 'daśā': Ait. Brā. VII, 32; Sat. Brā. IV, 2, 2, 11; 1, 1, 28; and in the Sūtras.

[1] E.g. Rv. I, 95, 7.

[2] Rv. X, 18, 11=Av. XVIII, 3, 50.

[3] Śat. Brā. III, 2, 1, 18.

[4] Rv. I, 95, 7.

[5] E.g. in Av. XIV, 2, 51; Rv. III, 53, 2.

[6] Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 1, 1, 3ff; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXIII, 1; Śat. Brā. III, 1, 2, 13ff.; 'nīvi' is probably from Tāmil 'nev,' to weave; cf. vern. 'newār'=woven straps.

[7] So also, the 'praghāta' is dedicated to plants or serpents: the 'antāḥ' of Av. XIV, 2, 51, is clearly='praghāta.'

[8] Specially in the case of men's cloths, this end being tucked up behind.

[9] Taitt. Saṃ. I, 8, 1, 1; II, 4, 9, 1; VI, 1, 1, 3; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXIII, 1; Taitt. Brā. I, 6, 1, 8; Pañc. Brā. XVII, 1; etc. The Vrātyas favoured braided 'tūṣa' fringes (dāma-tūṣāṇi). Apparently the 'tantavaḥ' of Śat. Bra. III, 1, 2, 13ff.='tūṣa,' for there 'otu' and 'tantu' are already represented by 'paryāsa' and 'anuchāda.' That 'tūṣa'=chaff, like lashes, is shown by its dedication to Agni.

[10] Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 1, 1, 3ff.; 'vātapā': Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXIII, 1; not in Śat. Brā. III, 1, 2, 13ff., where however 'sic' occurs.

[11] Probably preserved in the 'batan' (= border) of the Bengal weavers: e.g. in 'golā-batan' cloths (cf. (?) 'battnaul-kai': a caste of Madurā weavers); also in vern. 'bātā'=split-bamboo, used in strengthening borders of thatches, etc.

[12] Śat. Brā. III, 1, 2, 13ff.: 'atīrokāḥ': Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXIII, 1; 'atīkāśāḥ': Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 1, 1, 3ff. (probably wrong reading). 'Ārokāḥ' may be an adapted form of the Tāmil 'arukaṇi'= ornamental border of cloths. Cf. classification of shawls, etc. as 'ek-rokhā' and 'du-rokhā' acc. to the nature of their embroidered patterns.

[13] So also, they are dedicated to the 'nakṣatras.'

For ritual purposes the cloth had to be unbleached and unwashed,[1] but ordinarily it was worn white: as by the Vāśiṣṭhas.[2] Dyed[3] cloths with rich gold-thread brocades were affected by gay young women (typified by the attire of Ūṣas)[4]; and red and gold borders are indicated by their comparison with the horizons at sunrise and sunset.[5] But the Vrātya 'gṛhapati's favoured dark-blue ('kṛṣṇaśa': antelope-hued) cloths and borders.[6]

The manner of wearing the cloth is not directly indicated by any reference. The 'vāsas' however is always 'tied,' 'girt,' etc. ('nah'),[7]—which implies tucks and knots. The idiom 'nīviṃ kṛ'[8] shows that each individual wore the 'nīvi'

[1] E.g. in Śat. Brā. III, 1, 2, 13ff. ('ahata'). Cf. the traditional distinction in the uses of 'korā' and 'dholāi' cloths.

[2] Rv. VII, 33, 1 (śvityañcaḥ); cf. 83, 8; cf. 'śukraṃ atkam': Rv. 1, 95, 7; 'niktam atkam': IX, 69, 4.

[3] The female cloth-dyer ('rajayitrī') is known early: e.g., Vāja. Saṃ. XXX, 12; Taitt. Brā. III, 4, 7, 1.

[4] E.g. Rv. 1, 92, 4; X, 1, 6.

[5] Rv. I, 95, 7.

[6] Pañc. Brā. XVII, 14-16; cf. Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XXII, 4, etc.; 'akṛṣṇaṃ kṛṣṇadaśaṃ vā' is added in the Sūtras, and the name 'kadgu' (preserved in vern. 'khādi' and 'khaddaṛ?') is given to these varieties of cloths; 'valūkāntāni' of the older passage is explained in the Sūtras and comm. as red or blue-black borders,—which is no explanation; as 'dāmatūṣāṇi' in the same phrase denotes a 'style' of 'tūṣa', 'valūkāntāni' must mean a 'style' of the broader border, i.e., 'falling in folds', or 'pleated' (val-ūka); (probably done up with the help of 'gilā' and 'śāṅkh' in the same manner as 'deśī' dhūtis in the fashionable Bengal zemindār's wardrobe). The 'kṛṣṇaśa' vāsas would correspond to the modern 'nīlāmbarī', which as well as blue-black borders (kṛṣṇa-daśaṃ) on an indigo-dyed web. are Bengal specialities and favourites. (For the descr. 'antelope-hued', cf. mod. 'peacock-throated' variety). (It is curious that this peculiarity of the Vrātyas should in later days belong to the Mahomedan population of Bengal (also in some other provinces, e.g., Punjāb), who affect the blues as opposed to the reds, which are the 'Hindu' shades in weavers' tradition (cf. Watt: Comm. Prod. of Ind., s.v. Cotton); in the same connection Vrātyas are said to use 'silver' ornaments instead of the usual gold (—naturally, as silver occurs chiefly with iron ores in which the "Vrātya country" is rich); this, again, is a Mahomedan trait in Bengal. It may be noted that Bengal Mahomedans represent a large section of the indigenous basic population of the Province.)

[7] E.g. Av. XIV, 2, 70.

[8] Av. VIII, 2, 16 (what 'nivi' thou makest for thyself); 6, 20 (2 herbs to be borne in the woman's 'nīvi', evidently at the navel): XIV, 2, 49-50 (make thyself a 'nīvi' of this 'vāsas'—where the context shows that the 'nivi' is hanging folds of the 'vāsas'). It is difficult to see how a separate inner garment can be meant by 'nivi' in these passages (so V.I.); 'nīvi' is distinctly stated to be a *part* of the cloth, like 'praghāta', etc. In later use also 'nīvi' is a knot, gather or tuck, at the navel, of the fringed border which is primarily the 'nīvi'. **Thus, in those passages 'nivi' is best taken as the 'style' of**

(or āñclā) in his or her own way: evidently this refers to the same styles as the elaborate pleats and artistic waist-knots (nīvi-bandha) of men and women in the early sculptures and classical paintings and poetry. The ‘nīvi’ thus represents the modern ‘koñcā’ (pleats) and ‘gāṅṭ’ (knot)[1]: there is however no trace of the ‘kāchā’ (tuck of the plainer end of a cloth at the back). Probably the Dravidian style of wearing the cloth without such posterior tuck[2] was at one time the fashion in N. India also. The Vrātya preference of braided or tasselled ‘tūṣa’ fringes[3] may, however, indicate that, while others tucked up the ‘tūṣa’ in a full gather, the Vrātyas displayed the hanging ornamental fringe, by tucking only one corner of it.[4] The ‘nīvi’-knot was sometimes so fashioned as to form a pouch, wherein magic herbs could be borne.[5] Sometimes, also, the ‘nīvi’ consisted of simply two ‘tuckings up’ (‘udgūhana’)[6] at the sides (as now, specially with men). Elsewhere women are said to tie their ‘nīvi’ on the right side of the hip, the ‘nīvi’ being then covered by the upper garment; such ‘nīvi’ must have been an ample gather of folds and fringe-tassels, for there a bundle of ‘barhis’ represents the ‘nīvi.’[7] It seems probable that women did not wind a part of the ‘vāsas’ over the bosom and shoulders (as now generally done in N. India), which covered only the lower half of the body (as in Mālābār, etc.). The description of Ūṣas wearing rich brocaded cloth, and yet displaying her bosom,[8] would suggest this latter style; the ‘nīvi’ style itself implies that no part of the broad border was left for such covering, and the early sculptures, etc., do not show it.[9] Apparently the upper part of the body of men and women was

---

wearing the ‘nivi’ or border. It is possible however to see in ‘yat te vīsaḥ paridhānaṃ, yāṃ nīviṃ kṛṇuṣe tvaṃ’, a reference to the ordinary ‘wearing cloth’ *and* a separate specially woven strip to serve as an artistically tied waist-band, something like the ‘commerbund’ of medieval Dacca manufacture; this specialization and separation of the ‘nivi’ is also shown in quite early sculptures, etc. But even in that case the ‘nīvi’ would be an *outer* adjunct and not an ‘inner garment, forming one of three.’

[1] The former is more in evidence in Bengal, the latter in Bihār and westwards.

[2] Curiously, again, the Bengal Mahomedans affect this tuckless style; cf. n. 7, p. 64, (*re* Vrātyas).

[3] Vide ante.

[4] Also a Dravidian peculiarity.

[5] As in the Bihāri knot. Av. VIII, 6, 20. This style cannot have been confined to women, as not much later on, ‘nīvi’ came to mean deposit money or capital.

[6] Śat. Brā. III, 2, 1, 15.

[7] Śat. Brā. I, 3, 3, 6.

[8] Rv. I, 92, 4.

[9] In these the upper part of the body is often bare, covered only by various elaborate ornaments: sometimes a few lines are indicated to show a filmy wrap.

covered, when necessary, by another separate garment, either a loose wrap, like 'upavāsana,' 'aryāṇahana,' or 'adhīvāsa,' —or a tailor-made close-fitting jacket, bodice or cloak, like the 'pratidhi,' 'drāpi,' or 'atka.' Thus the bride had her 'upavāsana,' apparently a scarf or veil[1] (corresponding to the modern 'orṅā' used by women),—and the 'vāsas' of Mudgalānī that fluttered high up in the air,[2] was evidently such an 'uttarīya' scarf. 'Soma,' in the ritual, has his 'paryāṇahana,'—in addition to his 'upanahana' and 'uṣṇīṣa,'[3] —from which a strip two or three inches wide might be torn to form an 'uṣṇīṣa,' if necessary; so that the 'paryāṇahana' (lit. wrapped round about) was a pretty long and ample scarf of light texture.[4] The 'adhīvāsa' does not seem to have been close fitting like the 'atka' or 'drāpi,'[5] as it is an 'over-garment,' worn by princes over their inner and outer garments[6]; again the forests are the 'adhīvāsa' of mother earth licked by the fire-child[7]; it was thus more like a long loose-flowing dressing-gown, suiting both men and women[8]; it may not, however, have been a tailor-made garment at all, being called a 'vāsas'[9]; probably it was of the same sort as the 'upavāsana.' The 'pratidhi' must, from the context,[10] refer to a part of the bride's attire, apart from the newly woven, excellent garment[11]; apparently it consisted of one or two strips of specially made cloth drawn across or crosswise over the bust and tied at the back, to serve as a bodice,[12] or was a short and tight bust-bodice like the later 'kañculikā' (mod. 'kāñculi'). The 'drāpi' seems to have been a close-fitting[13] and gold-embroidered[14] vest,[15] used equally by men and women,[1] specially by prominent men[2] and gay women.[3] The 'atka' was confined to men; and was a long[4] and fully covering,[5] close-fitting[6] cloak, bright[7] and beautiful,[7] the stuff being bleached[7] cotton,[8] interwoven[9] or embroidered[10] with gold threads. 'Peśas' is gold-embroidered cloth generally[11]; the designs were apparently artistic and intricate,[12] and the inlay of gold heavy and brilliant[13]; where, however, the 'nṛtū' appears with 'peśāṃsi' on,[14] it might refer to a pleated skirt made of such brocaded cloth, like the medieval and modern 'ghāghrā' or 'peśwāz.'[15]. It is noteworthy that the early Vedic references to 'atka,' 'peśas,' 'śāmulya' and 'drāpi' come mostly from Āṅgirasa poets[16]; these were therefore primarily East Indian styles. Curiously enough, these are preserved in the later 'ackān,'[1] 'péswā (°z),'[2] and 'śāmlā,'[3] which agree fully with the Vedic items of dress; they are usually supposed to be derived from the Persian; but more probably it is a case of re-imposition of Persian stamp upon common Indo-Irāṇian items of material civilization; in fact, the Persians must have ultimately derived these styles from their Western-Aila ancestors,—from the Purāṇic point of view.[4]

---

[1] Av. XIV, 2, 49 and 65. (In the latter passage it may mean coverlet of a couch, being mentioned along with furniture).

[2] Rv. X, 102, 2.

[3] These three may well be rendered by the mod. terms, 'cādar' (or uṛuṇi), 'dhūtī' and 'pagṛī,' respectively.

[4] Sat. Brā. III. 3, 2, 3.

[5] So V.I.

[6] Sat. Brā. V, 4, 4, 3.

[7] Rv. I, 140, 9.

[8] Vide n. 7 above (mātuḥ); cf. Rv. X, 5, 4.

[9] E.g. Rv. I, 162, 16.

[10] Av. XIV, 1, 8.

[11] Av. XIV, 1, 7.45; the usual reference to a part of the chariot is hardly appropriate.

[12] This style is now found amongst Kolārian races, and is a specially festive one. (Cf. the cross cords in Hellenic drapery).

[13] Rv. I, 166, 10 (Cyavāna's old age like a 'drāpi'); probably 'drāpi'=a tight vest suitable for running about (drā).

[14] Rv. I, 25, 13 (hiraṇyayam); IV, 53, 2 (piśaṅgam); Av. V, 7, 10 ('hiraṇya-drāpi,' adj. of a woman).

[15] Av. XIII, 3, 1 (the sun wearing the 3 worlds, making a 'drāpi' of them: hence the 'drāpi' had three pieces, two side ones and one back, like a waistcoat; it was not a 'coat of mail' (so V.I.) being worn by women, and the use of 'vasānaḥ,' etc. (cf. 'drāpiṃ vasānaḥ,' Rv. IX, 86, 14) would rather show that it was made of 'vāsas').

---

[1] Cf. the same style in N. W. India, where both men and women show off their richly embroidered waistcoats.

[2] Rv. IX, 100. 9 (wearing 'drāpi' on becoming great).

[3] Av. V, 7, 10 ('hiraṇya-drāpi' worn by 'Arāti' likened to a courtesan).

[4] Rv. II, 35, 14 (food carried in one's own 'atka': i.e., in the long skirt made into an apron).

[5] Rv. V, 74, 5 ('vavriṃ atkaṃ, likened to Cyavāna's old age: probably being a tight fitting garment it showed many creases resembling wrinkled skin); cf. IV, 18, 5 (Indra born with 'atka'=his own covering glory).

[6] 'Surabhiṃ atkaṃ': Rv. VI, 29, 3; X, 123, 7.

[7] 'Like sun': Rv. VI, 29, 3; X, 123, 7; 'arjuna': Rv. IX, 107, 13; 'śukraṃ': Rv. I, 95, 7; 'niktaṃ': Rv IX, 69, 4; 'sudṛśī': Rv. I, 122, 2.

[8] As 'vyūtaṃ' and frequent use of 'vasānaḥ' shows; it cannot very well have been an armour (as sometimes translated and explained).

[9] 'Hiraṇyair vyūtaṃ': Rv. I, 122, 2.

[10] 'Hiraṇyayān': Rv. V. 55, 6.

[11] Rv. IV, 36, 7 (the best and attractive 'peśas' spread for the gods); cf. 'hiraṇya-peśas' worn by a house-holder and his wife: Rv. VIII, 31, 8; VII, 42, 1; Vāja. Saṃ. XIX, 82; 83; 89; etc. (vide other notes below).

[12] Rv. II, 3, 6; cf. Vāja. Saṃ. XX, 41 (design compared with the poets' songs). The manner of 'peśas' work described here is the same as the 'jari' and 'śalmā-cumki' work in the present day.

[13] Rv. VII, 34, 11 (the glittering surface of rivers='peśas'=Varuṇa: the 'jari' work is most faithfully described in this passage; any one who has seen the play of sunlight on the turbid lower Ganges will appreciate the similarity). Cf. X, 114, 3, where 'peśas' is apparently called bright as 'ghee' (i.e., golden).

[14] Rv. I, 92, 4-5; cf. also 'yuvatiḥ supeśāḥ': Rv. X, 114, 3.

[15] These are worn frequently in Upper India, but are specially associated with dancing-girls throughout the country.

[16] Thus *re* 'atka': Rv. I, 95, 7; 122, 2; IV, 18, 5; VI. 29, 3; VIII, 41, 7 are the Āṅgirasa refs.: 3 other refs. are Ātreya, and 2 Bhārgava; *re* 'peśas,' the Āṅgirasa refs. are: Rv. I, 92, 4; IV, 36, 7; 2 others being Vāśiṣṭha and Bhārgava: *re* 'śāmulya', the only early Vedic reference is in Av. (occurring in Rv. as well); *re* 'drāpi,' the Āṅgirasa refs. are: Rv. I, 116, 10; IV. 53, 2; Av. V, 7, 10; XIII, 3, 1; one being Kāśyapa, another Bhārgava.

It is remarkable that the 'uṣṇīṣa' is not mentioned in early Vedic literature, except in connection with the Vrātyas in the Av.[5]; it appears, however, oftener in the Yv. Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas, but again chiefly in connection with the Vrātyas[6] and Kings.[7] It seems likely therefore that turbans were not originally in use,[8] and were introduced as a style through the Vrātyas of the Prācī, amongst whom kingship is said to have arisen.[9] The Vrātya's 'uṣṇīṣa' was bright and white as day (while his hair was dark as night)[10]: it was evidently of some fine cotton stuff[11]; this was (according to the Sūtras) tied with a tilt and cross-windings.[12] The King's 'uṣṇīṣa' was tied in a special manner at ceremonial sacrifices[13]: the ends were gathered together and tucked away in front, so as to cover them up,[14] this tuck at front being preferred by the Śat. Brā. to the other ritual style of winding the turban quite round about.[1] These special styles show that ordinarily the princes wore turbans with loose hanging ends,[2] which were inconvenient and dangerous in ritual; accordingly, elsewhere in ritual, the 'uṣṇīṣa' is only a kerchief[3]: probably this kerchief tied round the head (in Tibeto-Burman or Kolārian fashion) was the original brāhmaṇical 'uṣṇīṣa,' so that when ruling princes joined in their rituals, they had to adopt a trimmer form of their unwieldy turbans[4]; so also 'Indrāṇī' wears an 'uṣṇīṣa' like a zone, of variegated hue,[5]—clearly a head-band of a many-coloured silken kerchief.[6]

---

[1] 'Ackān' used to be an item of respectable Hindu dress (as opposed to Mahomedan), but is now used chiefly by waiters or menials in Anglo-Indian establishments.

[2] 'Peśwā'=women's garment; 'peśwāz'=full-dress gown, sp. of dancers. Such special dancers' dress was noted by Greek writers of the 4th cent. B.C.

[3] Vide p. 59, n. 6.

[4] Vide infra. sec. *re* Persian influence in early social customs.

[5] Av. XV, 2, 1ff. (where it is one of the 'characteristics' of the Vrātya chieftain).

[6] Pañc. Brā. XVI. 6, 13; XVII, 1, 14 (amongst 'vrātyadhanāni'; read '°âdhānāni'?)

[7] Mait. Saṃ. IV, 4, 3, etc. (kṣatra at sacrifices); Śat. Brā. III, 3, 2, 3 (King 'Soma'); V, 3, 5, 23 (King at sacrifices); XIV, 2, 1, 18 (Indrāṇī); etc.; (fee of gold presented in an 'uṣṇīṣa', in 3 kośas: Kāṭh. Saṃ. XIII, 10; Taitt. Saṃ. III, 4, I, 4).

[8] The only head-dress known to Rv. being the 'śiprā,' a sort of helmet, evidently used only in battle: e.g. Rv. V, 54, 11; VIII, 7, 25; etc. Probably the Āryan incomers wore felt caps and hats (like various Scythic or Irāṇic tribes). 'Stūpa,' in the loosened 'stūpa' of Aryaman, or in the proper name 'Hiraṇya-stūpa,' may mean the Vedic 'ṭopi' ('ṭupi') or conical cap; for the shape, cf. the traditional ceremonial 'cap', 'ṭopara'; resembling a 'stūpa' structure.

[9] Cf. AV. XV, 2-10, which agrees fully with the unanimous Purāṇic tradition *re* first kings in the Sūta-Māgadha country.

[10] Av. XV, 2.

[11] Like the muslin 'pāgri-cloth' traditionally used.

[12] 'Tiryañ-naddhaṃ': Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XXI, 4. This is the traditional style again.

[13] Śat. Brā. V, 3, 5, 20ff.

[14] 'Saṃhṛtya purastād avaguhyati'.

No general footwear, again, is mentioned in the earlier Saṃhitās.[7] 'Paḍvīśa'[8] in the Rv. is applied to the leggings of a horse[9]; 'vaṭuriṇā padā'[10] probably refers to heavy ('mahā') covering footguards, used by chiefs[11] in battle; 'pat-saṅginī'[12] in the Av. also refers to somewhat clumsy hampering footfasteners used by soldiers.[13] The 'upānah' first occurs in the Yv. Saṃhitās[14] and the Brāhmaṇas, as used in ritual[15] and by the Vrātyas.[1] The ritual sandals or shoes were made of black-antelope- or boar-skins[2]; those of the Vrātyas are described in the Sūtras[3] as black and pointed (‘karṇinyau’), etc.[4]; these details indicate that the most stylish shoe-wearers of those days were the Vrātyas, just as they were the chief wearers of the ‘uṣṇīṣa.’ It is probable that the use of footwear in early times was to some extent limited by the common fashion (with both men and women) of wearing ‘khādis’ or anklets.[5]

---

[1] There is no mention in the Brā.° text of the ends of the turban being tied behind, drawn over one shoulder like an 'upavīta', and tucking in the waist-cloth. (Cf. Eggeling's note in S.B.E. and comm. on the passage).

[2] In traditional style: e.g. in Upper India generally, specially amongst military castes.

[3] Śat. Brā. IV, 5, 2, 2. 7; the 'uṣṇīṣa' that is tied round the eyes of the 'nāga seer' Arbuda, seems also to be a kerchief only: Ait. Brā. VI, 1. In Śat. Brā. III, 3, 2, 3, the 'emergency' turban bound with a strip of cloth 2/3 inches only in width, shows that the turban was often a mere band, or a 'ropy' head-gear with many twists, like that affected by Deccānis.

[4] Cf. the modifications of the royal 'āsandī' in ritual.

[5] Śat. Brā. XIV, 2, 1, 8. Cf. Rām. VI. 80 ("Rāk°." women wearing red 'uṣṇīṣas' while assisting at Indrajit's sacrifice).

[6] A Kolārian and Burmese feminine style, again.

[7] Tradition however ascribes a high antiquity to the 'upānah' (and the 'chatra'): it is said that Jamadagni-Bhārgava (contemporary of the famous Ṛgvedic Viśvāmitra) introduced their use for the comfort of his delicate wife, the Aikṣvāka princess Reṇukā (cf. Mbh. XIII. 95); hence either the Ikṣvākus took to shoes and sunshades after the Bhṛgus, or, more probably, the Bhṛgu brāhmaṇs learnt their use from the 'Solar' court, after Jamadagni's politic marriage. It is curious that the Av. (VI, 136-7) ascribes the first preparation of a potent hair-tonic to this Jamadagni-Bhārgava, who prescribed it for his daughter (apparently as stylish a lady as her royal mother!). All this agrees with the well known fact that the Bhṛgus were the most "Kṣatriyanised" of the brāhmaṇs. Probably other brāhmaṇic groups were not accustomed to shoes, etc., till later on: hence there is no very early mention of these in priestly literature.

[8] Rv. I, 166, 16.

[9] In Av., to foot-fetters or shackles (VIII, 1, 4; XII, 5, 15, etc.).

[10] Rv. I, 133, 2.

[11] Indra crushes enemy heads with them. It is interesting to compare the Indo-Scythic boots, as in Kaniṣka's statue and Kushan coins.

[12] Av. V, 21, 10.

[13] Apparently worn only during long marches or rapid flights.

[14] Also in Av. XX, 133, 4,—a late passage.

[15] Taitt. Saṃ. V, 4, 4, 4; 6, 6, 1, etc., Śat. Brā. V, 4, 3, 19; Kauṣ. Brā. III, 3 (staff and sandals).

Similarly the use of the ‘uṣṇīṣa,’ also, must have been restricted by the prevalent fashions of hair-dressing. Whole clans had distinctive styles of wearing the hair: thus the Vāśiṣṭhas could be recognized by their white clothes and ‘kaparda’ worn on the right side of the head[6]; so that they could never have used turbans; and (as already noticed) apparently no brāhmaṇs originally used them. Another style of hair-dressing was wearing the ‘kaparda’ in front (‘pulasti’)[7]; it seems probable that the Pulastyas (an early brāhmaṇ group cognate to the Agastyas, and like them associated with Deccān non-Āryans)[8] were so-called from this distinctive style. ‘Kesara-prābandhāyāḥ’ in the corrupt Atharvavedic passage[9] yields much better sense if read ‘°-prābandhānāṃ’ (specially in view of the fact that the whole context[10] refers to the results of the famous Haihaya-Bhārgava conflict) ; this reading would show the Bhārgavas to have been 'kesara-prābandhāḥ,' or 'wearing braided hair like manes,'—quite in agreement with similar Vedic references to brāhmaṇical hair-dressings. Some of the Vedic gods wear 'kaparda's and 'opaśa's, apart from goddesses like Sinīvālī[1] : thus Rudra has his hair in the 'kaparda' style[2]; so also Pūṣan[3]; and Indra's 'opaśa' is likened to the vault of heaven.[4] These divinities have marked indigenous and extra-'āryan' features; and it is significant that peculiar styles of hair-dressing to the exclusion of those of head-dresses should be characteristic of brāhmaṇs and such gods.

---

[1] Pañc. Brā. XVII, 14-16.

[2] Vide note 15, page 69.

[3] E.g. Kāt. Śr. Sūt. XXII, 4.

[4] According to details in other Sūtras (and comm.), these were also variegated, or like ‘varma,’ i.e., with metal knobs; etc.

[5] Cf. Rv. V, 54, 11; etc.

[6] Rv. VII, 33, 1; 83, 8.

[7] Vāja. Saṃ. XVI, 43; it is usually taken as meaning ‘wearing the hair plain’; but ‘placed in front’ suits the context much better, for Rudra's ‘kaparda’ is traditionally inclined in front (‘pulasti-kapardin’). It seems however equally probable that this ‘pulasti’ style was so called being that affected by the Pulastyas, and not for being a frontal mode of ‘Kaparda’-dressing. The clan-names of the Pulastyas, Pulahas and Agastyas mean the same thing (previous inhabitants), and correspond to the Pelasgü of Hellenic history; together with the Kratus they seem (from Purāṇic evidence) to have formed an earlier (pre-Āryan) stratum of civilization in India; they were finally either absorbed after struggles with Mānvas and Ailas, or were expelled seawards and westwards.

[8] In all Purāṇas; the Pulastyas would thus seem to have been “Śaivites.” (Q.—Has ‘kapardin,’ etc., a phallic symbolic significance? i.e., from ‘kapṛth’; in that case the Vāśiṣṭhas and Pulastyas may have been ‘phallic’ priests originally).

[9] Av. V, 18, 11; the various interpretations of commentators and translators making ‘kesara-prābandhā’ a cow or a woman with a she-goat, etc., are absurd; if the passage has to be emended, the above emendation (with ‘caramajān’ for ‘caramājāṃ’ etc.) would be best: the sense would then be, that the Vaitahavyas who destroyed even the new-born babes of the ‘kesara-prābandhāḥ’ Bhṛgus, perished with their whole kin, etc.,—which in fact is the unanimous tradition.

[10] Av. V. 18-19. This is a very remarkable early brāhmaṇical version of the famous Haihaya raids of Purāṇic tradition.

Women of course wore their hair in a number of different styles, which are, however, rather vaguely indicated by the special terms,[5] 'stukā,'[6] 'kurīra,' or 'kumba,' besides the 'opaśa' and 'kaparda' mentioned above. In the first place, it seems clear enough that 'opaśa' and 'kaparda,' being ascribed to men as well, were not distinctively feminine styles, and could be managed by the average long-haired man. Accordingly young maidens are said to wear their hair in four 'kaparda's.[7] What the 'kaparda' of men was like, can be very well made out from the traditional representations of the 'kapardin' god and the hair-dressing of his followers[8] : it was a spiral coil of the braided, plaited or matted hair, piled on the top of the head at different angles. It was apparently the same in the case of women, for the maidens' four 'kaparda's are compared to the four corners of the altar,[9] and so cannot mean 'braids' or 'plaits,'[10] while Sinīvālī's 'kaparda' is an alternative style classed with 'kurīra' and 'opaśa.'[11] The four 'kaparda's of maidens must have together formed a crown-shaped coiffure. The 'opaśa' as worn by men probably consisted in gathering up all the hair with a small top-knot, leaving it loose enough to form a dome-like cover or flounced cap; this would explain most of the figures in the texts connected with 'opaśa': thus the 'opaśa's of Indra and Soma[1] are like the clouded or vaulted sky; the thatched net-covered[2] roofing of a house (compared to a woman) is like 'opaśa' spread over the 'viṣūvant'[3]; and the knob-like horns of the year-old cow are 'opaśas.'[4] These last similes show that the 'opaśa' was of the same style in the case of women also,—unless the qualification 'su' in Sinīvālī's description[5] is taken to mean a heavier 'kaparda' and an ampler 'opaśa,'—and with the probable exception of the covering and withholding net[6]; but 'hariḥ' 'opaśa' of Soma[7] might refer to coloured covering-nets used by men as well. It seems that sometimes 'opaśa (by a common figure) meant this covering-net only, as in the case of the bride's hair being dressed into a 'kurīra' and 'opaśa,' where the two apparently form parts of one composite coiffure.[8] The practical identity of the masculine and feminine 'opaśa's is also shown by the Av. charm, which regards the unsexing of a rival as complete only when, after the 'opaśa,' the 'kurīra' and then the 'kumba' are, in addition placed on his head.[9] These two therefore were the distinctively womanly styles[10]: and they are, accordingly not ascribed to men in the texts. As 'kurīrin' is used secondarily of a horned animal,[11] the 'kurīra' must have been a horn-shaped coiffure, possible only with the long braids of women; a net or veil ('opaśa.' [2].) may have been hung from this 'horn.[12] The

---

[1] It is to be noted that in Epic-Purāṇic mythology, Sinīvālī and other cognate goddesses are specially Āṅgirasa and domestic ones. (So also a chief feature of Indo-Āryan mythology is absence or unimportance of goddesses). Mudgala of Pāñcāla, who became an Āṅgirasa, wore a 'kaparda' (carrying at the same time an 'aṣṭrā' like Vrātya chiefs) : Rv. X, 103, 8.

[2] Rv. I, 114, 1. 5; Vāja. Saṃ. XVI, 10; 29; 43; 48; 59. (Occasionally a Rudra wears scattered tufts or has a shaven head : Vāja. Sam. XVI, 59 and 29 respectively).

[3] Rv. VI, 55, 2; IX, 67, 11.

[4] Rv. I, 173, 6; VIII, 14, 5; the sense of 'diadem' is not at all necessary.

[5] The commentators are hopelessly contradictory and evasive with regard to these terms.

[6] Cf. E. vern. 'thokā'=lump.

[7] Rv. X, 114, 3.

[8] The Śaiva devotees; this style is also affected by men in Orissa and the S.E., even now.

[9] Vide ante.

[10] As taken in VI.

[11] Vāja. Saṃ. XI, 56.

---

[1] Rv. I, 173, 6; VIII, 14, 5, and IX, 71, 1, respectively.

[2] The 1000-eyed 'akṣu.'

[3] Av. IX, 3, 8; the parting of the hair would naturally be covered by such cap-like 'opaśa.' (It will be noted that such 'opaśa' would have a frontal aspect exactly like a curved thatch with hanging eaves).

[4] Pañc. Brā. IV, 1, 1; cf. 'dvy-opaśāḥ' in XIII, 4, 3. (It is not the long fully grown horns of kine that are referred to; the sense of horn here is obviously metaphorical and secondary).

[5] Taitt. Saṃ. IV, 1, 5, 3; Mait. Saṃ. II, 7, 5; Vāja. Saṃ. XI, 56. (It is difficult to see how 'su' can refer to a Vedic custom of wearing false plaits of hair).

[6] Indicated by the simile in Av. IX, 3, 8.

[7] With this may be compared the zone-like head-band of variegated hue worn by Indrāṇī. Vide ante.

[8] Av. XIV, 1, 8=Rv. X, 85, 8. Vide infra, *re* 'kurīra.'

[9] Av. VI, 138, 1-3.

[10] Cf. Āpast. Śr. Sūt.,—"Kumba and kurīra on the patnī's head."

[11] Av. V, 31, 1 (as already noted, 'opaśa' cannot mean such a *long* horn).

[12] As probably in the bride's hair-dress; (vide note 8 above). This style is still to be found in the hill tracts between the upper Sutlej and Ganges.

‘ kumba ’[1] is evidently the vern. khoṃpā ’[2] of later times, the specially feminine, hemispherical or pot-shaped coil at the back of the head.

---

[1] The form and sense of the word suggests a connection with ‘kumbha,’ ‘kambu,’ etc., all implying something rounded. (Probably ‘kumbyā’ as a form of measured speech like sāman or gāthā is taken from some process or feature in the ‘kumba-’ dressing: cf. Śat. Brā. XI, 5, 7, 10).

[2] It is to be noted that the ‘kumba’ occurs only in Av. (and much later on in Sūtras); the presumption therefore is that it was primarily an Āṅgirasa style; it may be connected with Tāmil ‘kudum’=‘coil of hair’ and ‘pā,’ to weave or ‘braid.’ Cf. vern. ‘kadam (ba),’ a flower, and ‘kadṃā,’ a sort of toffee,—both obviously deriving their names from the various elaborate modes of the ‘kumba.’

TRACES OF PRIMITIVES SEX-RELATION AND SPECIAL CUSTOMS

There is no explicit statement in the earlier Saṃhitās (as there is in the Epic-Purāṇic literature)[1] of any notion that at a remote period the regular and correct marriage was unknown, and that the institution was gradually developed or introduced by way of reform. But there are clear indications in them that an established standard of marriage was only evolved through various preceding stages of sexual relationships, more or less primitive in character.

Such relationship was not uncommon in early times as between brothers and sisters. Though it seems from the Yama-Yamī dialogue[2] (which is best regarded as an example of a very early form of 'social drama') that, at the time when it was composed (apparently the latter part of the Ṛgvedic period) such connections were coming to be regarded as incestuous, yet the very fact that this could be made the subject of a serious piece of composition with a 'moral' in it, shows that they were still not very rare; thus Yama (an early legendary hero selected for effective illustration) is made to say "verily there will come other ages wherein brothers will unite with sisters," etc., obviously referring to the practices current in the poet's generation, or at least those within the memory of his times. This is confirmed by other references[3] of the same or earlier period, which can only mean that brother-sister connections and wooings were quite normal and recognized, in the Vedic priestly society at least; thus, a favourite god is appreciated for wooing his sister; the brother is classed with the husband or the paramour as a person normally approaching a woman; and for the sake of a son and heir, men may unite with their sisters; while in one of the Vedic marriage mantras[4] union with an adorned 'jāmi' (sister) sitting among the fathers, is regarded as Viśvāvasu's birth-right, so that the context would suggest that the marriage being celebrated was also one between a 'jāmi' and

[1] Cf. what is said about Śvetaketu in Mbh. I, 122, 4724-'35, and about Dīrghatamas in ibid. 104, 4202 ff.

[2] Rv. X, 10.

[3] Rv. X, 162, 5; VI, 55, 4; Av. VIII, 6, 7; cf. Ait. Brā., the 'gāthā' in the Śunaḥśepa legend. Vide infra.

[4] Av. XIV, 2, 33.

her brother.[1] It seems probable, from the selection of Yama and Yamī as a type (in the above poem), and from Yamī's arguments, that twins were regarded in a superstitious primitive age as specially destined[2] for such relationship, more than other brothers and sisters.

The case of fathers and daughters is not equally clear; it is very early recognized as incestuous, but seems to have been once frequent, almost a permitted practice. Most of the references in the early Saṃhitās[3] to this form of incestuous connexion are explained mythologically in the Brāhmaṇas.[4] Still the fact remains that such a relationship serves as a simile or allegory, and is described in a manner that shows approval; and even alleged mythological features very often have a basis in primitive conditions, which the believers in those legends may have outgrown, or grow out of actual and traditional early events, to justify which legends are interwoven in course of time.[5] The ascription of such connexions to Prajāpati and his daughter or Pūṣan and his mother,[6] shows that the Vedic priest could still conceive of such relationships as not at all damaging to the prestige of his gods. But actual amours of this type were known: thus there is a plain reference to father-daughter connexions in the Av., which would show that these were common enough to be alluded to, and even presumed, in a domestic rite concerning women[7]; while in the Ait. Brā. a very old 'gāthā' is cited (in connection with the royal consecration and the Śunaḥśepa story),[8] where for the sake of sons men are said to unite with their mother and sister as with a wife.[1] Such facts probably point to the ultimate origin of the practice[2] of ‘appointing’ a daughter to bear a son for the father, while remaining with him, such a son being regarded as the father's own son.[3] The father-daughter connexion, as a more or less recognized practice or permissible license, could possibly have originated in a primitive, strongly patriarchal group, which, being still unsettled and raiding about, would at the same time have a minimum supply of women[4]; in such a case the essential sons,[5] not ordinarily obtained, would come through the daughter. It is noteworthy that ‘duhitṛ’ primarily implies no connection with the father as such, but simply denotes woman as ‘nourisher of a child’ or ‘potential mother.’[6] With the passing of primitive conditions the daughter's position would change, and she would come to be "appointed" to bear a son for her father's family in an indirect way.

---

[1] Vide infra. for the composite character of the marriage hymns.

[2] In Purāṇic tradition also, the twins of Uttara-Kuru are devoted married pairs all through life.

[3] E.g. Rv. X, 61, 5-7.

[4] Ait Brā. III, 33, 5; Śat. Brā. I, 7, 4, 1; Pañc. Brā. VIII, 2, 10.

[5] Cf. the legend of Vṛṣaṇāśva's daughter Menā (Rv. I, 51, 13 and in Brā°s); Indra's applauded part in it seems to have been introduced to gloss over or justify an ancient brother-sister connexion (Indra plays a similar part in other legends of questionable morality); the Purāṇic inclusion of Menā in the 'pitṛ-kanyā' group (vide infra) apparently presupposes such a tradition of her incestuous connexion.

[6] Rv. VI, 55, 5; (also Pūṣan and his sister; ibid. 4).

[7] Av. VIII, 6, 7. The Atharva-vedic charms are mostly the products of stages of civilization earlier than the Ṛgvedic; but this particular one being included in part within the Ṛgveda also must have represented more or less contemporary conditions; such conditions are regarded as normal amongst townspeople in the Jātakas; vide infra.

[8] Ait. Brā. VII, 15; cf. Śāṅkh. Śr. Sūt. XV, 17-25. This 'gāthā belongs at least to the 10th century B.C., while it refers to Hariścandra's time, about eight centuries before that according to Purāṇic tradition. For Purāṇic notices of incestuous unions in Aikṣvāka and other dynasties of that age, vide infra. The practice in this 'gāthā' however is advocated by ṛṣis, before a rājanya.

It does not clearly appear how far the practice of sister-marriage was the result of a similarly strong patriarchal and isolative tendency or that of an earlier matriarchal state of society amongst some at least of the Vedic tribes[7]: thus Yamī's insistence on the point[8] that Yama's conduct is unbrotherly, and for the sake of ‘protection’ and ‘offspring’ (‘a grandson for their father’) he should be her husband, is a patriarchal trait; on the other hand her marked initiative in the matter and bold wooing[9] is a matriarchal one, while the position is reversed in other cases.[10] The probability of the former conditions is suggested by facts like these: The 'bhrātṛ' is not characterized by blood-relationship, but is primarily the 'supporter and master' of the 'svasṛ' and others[1]; an external woman could be taken into a family as a 'svasṛ,' a sort of 'companion,'[2] to be thus supported; sister as a blood-relation ('jāmi-svasā,' and then only 'jāmi') is a later development, as shown by the adjectival use of 'jāmi'[3]; 'jñāti' means 'brother and sister' primarily, as being best acquainted with one another[4]; the disputed precedence (referred to in a Brā°.) at ceremonial family meals, of the sister over the wife,[5] probably points to a time when the sister had actually the place of the wife, in the family and its ritual; when the sister was no longer normally in that position, she was still supported and controlled (in her social and marriage relations) by the 'bhrātṛ.'[6] On the other hand, there is some trace of the greater importance of the sister and the mother in earlier times: The sister's claim to precedence over the wife in family ritual is one indication[7]; the dread of the 'sister's curse'[8] shows her early influence, probably as the original mistress of the family; she is the best 'jñāti' of the brother[9]; the 'putra'[10] belonged specially to the 'mātṛ,'[11] and the mother is sometimes the 'bhartrī' or supporter of the family[12]; while old maids stay on in their mother's house, as well as in the father's or brother's[13]; 'mātarā'[14] was enough to designate both parents, and the mother comes before the father in such early expressions as 'mātarā-pitarā' and 'mātā-pitaraḥ'[15]; some instances of the precedence of the mother in the family[16] are found in later Vedic texts, but they are to be regarded as examples of survival of earlier conditions rather than as new developments; the use of metronymics, again, though found mainly in later Vedic texts,[1] goes back to the Ṛgvedic period itself.[2]

---

[1] The practice prevailed in ancient Irāṇ (an important point, since Purāṇic tradition regards ‘Irāṇic Aryans as subsequent offshoots of the Midland Aryans of India, amongst whom the Madras, Vāhtekas and other North Westerners had similar practices; cf. Mbh. VIII, 40; 44-'5); also amongst the old Irish, according to Strabo (IV, 5, 4). For Purāṇic parallels, vide infra.

[2] Rv. III, 31, 1. (This obscure passage seems to hint at that ultimate origin: ‘pitā yatra duhituḥ seka ṛñjan, etc.’). The technical term ‘putrikā’ is post-Vedic (from Nir. and Sūtras onwards).

[3] Gaut. Dh. Sūt. XXVIII, 20 (a sūtra preserving much of older conditions).

[4] But the above references to actual occurrences belong to a period when that hypothetical stage was certainly passed; they are therefore to be regarded as lingering survivals or as lapses into laxity in certain circles (cf. Purāṇic parallels infra.).

[5] The desire for many sons is a most prominent early Vedic feature.

[6] VI., I, 371.

[7] It is to be remembered that (according to tradition) some of the Vedic tribes were originally Dravidian (non-Aila), and they may have retained matriarchal features late into the Ṛgvedic or even the Brāhmaṇa period.

[8] Rv. X. 10, 9. 12. 1. 3.

[9] Rv. X. 10. 1. 3. 5. 7. 9. 11. 13.

[10] Rv. VI, 55, 4. (It is to be noted here that some of the sister-marriages in the Purāṇic dynastic lists are polygamic, while a few others seem to be polyandric, or show similar initiative of sister. Vide infra.).

---

[1] For references, vide VI., I, 30; II, 113; 486; 495-'96.
[2] Rv. X, 108, 9.
[3] For references, vide V.I., I, 284-'85.
[4] Rv. X, 117, 9.
[5] Ait. Brā. III, 37.
[6] Vide note 1 above.
[7] Vide note 5 above.
[8] Av. II, 10, 1 (=Taitt. Brā. II, 5, 6, 3); IX, 4, 15; II, 7, 2.
[9] Vide note 4 above.
[10] But 'sūnu' is specially associated with 'father' (Rv. I, 1, 9; etc.); cf. the vernacular idiom: 'mā' and 'po,' or 'put,' compared with 'bāp' and 'beṭā'; it seems as if 'put-ra' (put, po, polā, pilè) was originally a Dravidian word and hence associated in idiom with mother primarily.
[11] Rv. X, 18, 11.
[12] Av. V, 5, 2; Taitt. Brā. III, 1, 1, 4.
[13] Av. I, 14, 2.
[14] Rv. III, 33, 3; VII, 2, 5.
[15] Rv. IV, 6, 7; Vāja. Saṃ. IX, 19; Taitt. Saṃ. I, 3, 10, 1; VI, 3, 11, 3.
[16] Bṛhad. Upan. IV, 7, 5 (and in Sūtras sometimes).

The practice of polyandry is generally supposed[3] to be un-Vedic; but though absolutely clear instances are not found in the Vedic texts, yet certain other customs of Vedic and post-Vedic society show evidently polyandric traits, so that the practice must have existed either side by side[4] or at not a very remote age. It has been held that 'niyoga' has nothing to do[5] with polyandry: but it would be more in accordance with natural development to recognize in it a later special case of an earlier general practice, by which the family continuity was assured by all the brothers having an uxor communis.[6] The later 'niyoga' is clearly a legal fiction, not a new device, but a modification of a wider traditional or popular practice; and the custom that formed the basis of this 'reform' and theory, must have been a survival of polyandry and connected 'devṛ'-marriage. The later 'niyoga,' being a restriction, contemplated only the begetting of a son by the 'appointed' kinsman; but the Vedic 'devṛ'-marriage is not so confined: for, in the funeral rite, the son of the widow seems to be present, to receive his father's bow, etc.,[7] and the 'didhiṣu' brother-in-law claims her as full wife with no limited object, but for love, progeny and property generally[8]; it is obvious that the main concern in this rite is a normal remarriage of the widow, who oftener than not must have had borne sons already (the Vedic marriage being one between fully developed persons)[9]; besides, when the Vedic wife needs a son only, in the husband's absence or other circumstances, to continue his line, she can have the son through agencies other than the 'devṛ,'[10] though elsewhere she obtains her sons after widowhood by him[1]; so also Manu, preserving and following no doubt an earlier tradition, applies the term 'didhiṣū-pati' to the brother-in-law married to his widowed sister-in-law not only for the sake of issue, but also for conjugal love, the widow being called 'didhiṣū' owing to the element of 'wooing' in her second marriage, which is recognized as a real one over and above 'niyoga.'[2] The 'didhiṣu' brother-in-law's immediate and acknowledged claim[3] on the widowed sister-in law, points to the likelihood of his having been looked upon as a possible (or even secondary) husband before widowhood. Instances of such view are frequent and clear in the Epic-Purāṇic tradition referring to the Vedic age[4]; so also in several passages of the marriage hymns the bride is described as 'devṛ-kāmā,' 'desiring union with brothers-in-law'.[5] The epic tradition also shows that at the close of the Ṛgvedic age this preferential claim to the widow was not confined to the younger brother (as his elder's successor) but also belonged to an elder brother.[6] Āśvalāyana's school preserves apparently a much earlier Vedic tradition according to which these rights belonged not only to brothers, but any other representative of the family, e.g. a pupil or a familiar slave.[7] These facts indicate that one time several members of a family group, brothers or otherwise related, often had a common wife. Thus in some of the marriage-mantras there is scarcely any sense in the bride's being hailed as 'vīrasū devṛ-kāmā,' unless the marriage referred to in those passages is taken to be a polyandric one, where the eldest of the co-bridegrooms so addresses the bride, alluding to her other secondary husbands, together with whom ("we") he hopes to thrive with her[1]; the Vedic marriage-hymns obviously do not represent any single standard type of marriage, but are more correctly a collection of mantras of different origins,[2] referring to more than one form of marriage,[3] among which the polyandric is apparently included; so also, in some of the consummation mantras "we" and "men" or "husbands" in relation to the bride may very well refer to these 'devṛ's 'desired by the bride' along with the chief bridegroom.[4] In fact the 'sādhāraṇī' wife seems to be directly referred to in the Ṛgveda,[5] where the Maruts are described as enjoying their 'common' and eager associate Rodasī, who, with dishevelled tresses and mind devoted to her lords, woos them to unite with her, like Sūryā mounting the car of the *two* Aśvins,—references to which again, are frequent in Ṛv. Specific historical instances indeed are not named (as they are in the Epic-Purāṇic tradition[6] regarding Vedic conditions); but a few passages[7] probably refer to the practice, specially those where husband*s* are mentioned in relation to a single wife,[8]—in most of which grammatical or mythological explanations are inadequate[9]; thus all that is said about the three previous husbands of every bride, in the marriage hymns[10] and elsewhere,[11] is best understood as a relic of a gradually disused custom of polyandry, which was transformed into an allegory, most probably

---

[1] Naturally, as lists of teachers are supplied here; cf. the names of teachers in Brā°., Āraṇ°., and Upan°.

[2] Rv. I, 147, 3; 152, 6; 158, 6; IV. 4, 13; cf. VI, 10, 2.

[3] So most Vedic scholars except Mayr (Indisches Erbrecht); they usually take individual passages in consideration, and singly some of these may be given any interpretation.

[4] Which is quite likely, considering that it is known as a special form to literature of almost every other period, and that it has survived down to the present day in a few districts.

[5] So V.I.

[6] Certain passages in the Vedic marriage-formulae may refer to this earlier custom and its object; vide infra.

[7] Rv. X, 18, 9.

[8] Av. XVIII, 3, 2=Rv. X, 18, 8.

[9] Vide infra.

[10] E.g. Purukutsānī obtaining a son during husband's imprisonment (Rv. IV, 42. 8. 9; Śat. Brā. XIII, 5, 4, 5; etc.); or Puraṃdhi-Vadhrimati in spite of husband's impotence (Rv. I, 116, 13; 117, 24; VI, 62, 7; X, 39, 7; cf. X, 65, 12). If this Purukutsa is the same as the Purukutsa of Purāṇic lists, then, however, Purukutsānī's son was apparently obtained through her 'devṛ'; vide infra.)

---

[1] Rv. X, 18, 8; 40, 2; (the object of attainment of sons can only be inferred from "janitvam" in the former passage).

[2] Manu, III, 173. (The simile in Rv. X, 40, 2, shows clearly the 'didhiṣū' character of the widow, and the real marriage she contracts.)

[3] Vide note 1 above; and Av. XVIII, 3, 2.; Taitt Āraṇ. VI, 1, 3; Āśval. Gṛh. Sūṭ. IV, 2, 18.

[4] Cf. the attitude of Bṛhaspati towards Mamatā, and Puṣkara towards Damayantī (vide *infra* for fuller details).

[5] Rv. X, 85, 44; Av. XIV. 2, 17, 18, etc.; vide n. 8. p. 80,

[6] E.g. in the case of Bhiṣma and the widows of Vicitravīrya (vide infra).

[7] Āśval. Gṛh. Sūt. IV, 2, 18. The inclusion of the 'pupil' shows that the custom was specially brāhmaṇic: the famous Śvetaketu was begotten by a 'pupil' (vide infra); the eligibility of the 'dāsa' for such connections is illustrated in both brāhmanic and non-brāhmaṇic circles, in early as well as subsequent periods: cf. the Yv. reference to connexions between Śūdras and Ārya women; the epic story of the sage Mataṅga's parentage; the Greek accounts about the Nandas, and similar references to pre-Buddhistic court scandals in the Midlands in the Jātakas; and Vāts. Kā. Sūt. V, 6, 12. re. 'dāsa' connexions in the harems, referring to post-Mauryan and probably earlier court customs. The commentator on this last distinguishes 'dāsa' from 'ceṭa' as 'born in the family' and 'external' respectively; the 'dāsa' of Āśval. Gṛ. Sūt. may therefore be such a 'dāsa,' related to the deceased by blood, and hence a good substitute for a brother. (Probably 'jāra-dāsa' would be a better reading than 'jarad-dāsa'; or 'jarat' is to be taken as meaning "hymn-uttering,' poetic and scholarly, i.e., as learned as the master; the sense of 'old and senile' would be absurd in their context).

[1] Av. XIV, 2, 17.18; 1, 39; Ṛv. X, 85, 44; cf. note 8 below.

[2] Probably often misapplied by the later Sūtras; the variant reading 'deva-kāmā' shows an attempt at conscious emendation.

[3] E.g. polygamy in Av. XIV, 2, 52; vide infra.

[4] Cf. n. 1, p. 11 and Av. XIV, 2, 14.38; Ṛv. X, 85, 37 ('we' and 'men'); 38 (patibhyo jāyām).

[5] Ṛv. I, 167, 4.5.

[6] Vide infra.

[7] Cf. note 5 above: and Ṛv. VIII, 17, 7 (janirivâbhisaṃvṛtaḥ). In Ṛv. VII, 33, 13, the legend deriving the Vāśiṣṭhas and Agastyas from a common mother 'Urvaśī' and Mitra and Varuṇa (though based on an early misunderstanding of names) shows that eminent ṛṣi families regarded sharing of a wife by two persons as nothing unseemly; so also, the above reference to 'sādhāraṇī' wife comes from an 'Agastya' ṛṣi. With this may be compared the well-known and much misunderstood Purāṇic tradition of the Bhāradvājas and other brāhmaṇ gotras being 'dvāmuṣyāyaṇas' by origin (vide infra). The biandry in the Mitrāvaruṇa legend has other parallels in the Epics.

[8] Ṛv. X, 85, 37.38; Av. XIV, 1, 44.52.61; 2, 14.27. cf. n. 3, p. 81; Also Av. II, 36, 6.7, where a maiden is 'given unto husbands' (vide infra).

[9] 'Majestis causa': Weber: Ind. Stud. 5, 191; 'generic': Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 326; 'mythological': Delbrück: Ind. Ver. 543.

[10] Ṛv. X, 85, 40.41 = Av. XIV. 2, 3.4.

[11] Av. 17, 2. for other Brā. Sūt. and quotations, vide Whitney, Av. p. 754.

representing the life stages of a maiden till marriage[1]; fathers-in-law are mentioned several times in a similar way[2]; but it is uncertain whether polyandry is referred to in any one instance; there is however less of uncertainty where at a sacrifice[3] the wife is described as 'having noble husbands'; her evident importance and the fertility ritual which includes her denuding and wetting in the presence and with the help of the conductors of the sacrifice, are probably indications that the rite was originally performed by the joint husbands of a common wife; so also, a polyandric family custom is very likely referred to in a group of charms (used to get marriageable maidens happily settled),[4] two of which admonish the girl to 'turn her right side to all the responsive suitors,' and 'give her unto husband*s*.'[5] The striking customs of using metronymics (in early as well as later Vedic literature) may have originated as much (or even more) in a practice of polyandry and laxity among brāhmaṇ women,[6] with resultant uncertainty of paternity, as in that of polygamy[7]; the former view, moreover, is supported by the Ṛgvedic case of Māmateya,[8] the epic case of Draupadeya,[9] and the later Vedic case of Jābāla,[10] amongst others. It may be noted in this connection that the occasional precedence and economic independence of the mother seem to be indicated in some Vedic texts.[11]

---

[1] Vide infra.

[2] Rv. X, 95, 12; Av. XLV, 2, 27; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XII, 12.

[3] Taitt. Saṃ III, 5, 6.

[4] Av. II, 36; the two passages are vv. 6.7. As with the collection of marriage-mantras, here too, the charms for securing the marriage of girls apparently refer to different marriage customs; thus v. 5 refers to securing a lover on a ferry-boat (cf. the well-known epic case of Satyavatī and the Kṛṣṇ-ite tradition), v. 1 to love-choice at 'Samanas', v. 3 to polygamic and v. 4 to monogamic marriages; so that vv. 6, 7 may very well refer to polyandric marriage. This is followed by 'so that she might find one after her wish,' which apparent contradiction seems only to mean that the chances are that she will find at least one agreeable husband among those to whom she is given: a naïve defence of the custom surely!

[5] In Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 1, 6, 6, it is said that as women love singers, so if there is a singer in a family, men give their daughters in marriage with that *family*, even if there be others in plenty: this however may be interpreted in different ways, though a reference to polyandry is possible. The parallel of the Pāṇḍava polyandry, where Draupadī was so given in marriage chiefly on account of Arjuna's attainments (musical included) is remarkable.

[6] As shown in priestly as well as non-priestly literature (vide infra).

[7] As supposed by Keith in Ait. Āraṇ. 244, n. 2. Metronymics may also partly have been due to Niyoga (as in the well-known epic instances) or to the reputation of women teachers (as in Brā°. and Upan°. sometimes); there may be in the custom a trace of matriarchal society, for it is gradually becoming clear that the brāhmanic priesthood was originally extra-Āryan (vide infra).

[8] Rv. I, 147, 3, etc.

[9] Vide Sör. Index, s.v.

[10] Chānd. Upan. IV, 4. 1.2.4; cf. Sat. Brā. X, 3, 3, 1, etc.

[11] (Vide p. 77, and n. 10-16 there); cf. similar indications in the Epic-Purāṇic stories about Bharadvāja and Dīrghatamas (vide infra).

Widow-burning was practised among many primitive Indo-Germanic races in Asia and Europe,[1] and it can only be expected to have existed among the early Indo-Āryans in some form or other. But the Vedic literature shows very few traces of such a custom: partly no doubt because these texts are priestly in character, and widow-burning is known to have prevailed elsewhere mainly amongst the non-priestly warrior families; and partly because even amongst the ruling classes, cases of widow-burning were rare (and prevented) throughout the Vedic period,—as shown by authentic Kṣatriya dynastic traditions[2]; while in the 'brāhmaṇ' society sex-relations seem to have been too lax to admit of the prevalence of such a practice.[3]

The hymns of domestic ceremonial and magic in the 10th Book do not properly belong to the Ṛgveda, as their position amply shows; they must have been selected and abridged from an older and better recension of the Atharvaveda or a corresponding collection of traditional 'social' lore (as opposed to 'sacrificial'). If, therefore, widow-burning is not referred to as an ancient custom in the Rv., whereas it is in the corresponding sections of the Av.,[4] it does not prove anything beyond this, that the compiler of the former chose to omit certain passages in his abridgment.[5] The full passage in the Av.,[6] which constitutes an unit (while the selection in the Rv.[7] is rather abrupt), refers first[8] to the voluntary self-immolation of the widow as her 'dharma.' (ancient customary duty), but treats her 'lying down by the departed' as only a *formal* fulfilment of the old custom (though some attempts must have been genuine),—this 'lying beside' being supposed to 'assign her progeny and property,' by something like a legal fiction[9]; the next verse[10] makes this attainment of 'progeny and property' possible, by transferring the widow as 'wife' to her 'didhiṣu' who grasps her hand (raising and leading her away); the 'didhiṣu' then expresses satisfaction[1] at having saved 'a young woman, enclosed with blind darkness, and led about, living, for the dead.' Evidently widow-burning was a defunct custom at this time, represented only by a ritual 'semblance,' and positively prevented from being renewed in any way by an immediate re-marriage. It is possible that the expressions in the last passage may refer to burning of the widow by relatives, who led her about blindfolded; but this contradicts the first statement regarding the widow's own choice; in any case the rite is deliberately prevented; probably only one of these contradictory passages was meant to accompany the other (about re-marriage), according as[2] the particular case was one of voluntary or involuntary 'suttee'; or, the expressions in question might simply be figurative, describing the grief-stricken and helpless state of the young widow.

---

[1] Herodotos: IV. 71 (Scythian); V. 5 (Thracian); Porcopius (De Bello Gothico): II. 14 (Gothic); Weinhold: Altnord. Leb., 476 ff. (German); cf. Zimmer: Alt. Leb., 331.

[2] Vide infra.—On general grounds it has been supposed (cf. VI. 1, 488-'9, and Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 331) that even amongst the Kṣatriyas the practice could not have been universal, owing to the wastefulness of burning all wives of kings, and the necessity of sparing even the chief wife. This is amply borne out by 'tradition,' where cases are known of transfers of the harems, and even of the principal wives of princes to their successors, related or otherwise (vide infra for details).

[3] Thus no 'brāhmaṇic' case of 'suttee' is known to Purāṇic tradition (Various instances of such laxity have been referred to in these pages.)

[4] Av. XVIII, 3, 1-3, perhaps also 4.

[5] Cf. similar abridgment in the wedding hymn.

[6] Av. XVIII, 3, 1-3.

[7] Rv. X, 18, 8.

[8] Av. XVIII, 3, 1.

[9] This formal ritual and legal fiction seems to have given rise to the ballad of Vyuṣitāśva's wife (in its present form) in the Mbh. (vide infra).

[10] Av. XVIII, 3, 2.

It follows from all this that in Vedic society women of child-bearing age did not normally remain widows for any length of time, being almost immediately re-married[3]; this is probably the force of 'ime avidhavāḥ supatnīḥ'[4] in the same funeral hymn; and it accounts for the rare occurrence of 'vidhavā' as such,[5] beside the mention of other widows going to be re-married ('gartāruh')[6] or actually re-married ('punarbhū').[7]

The widow often married her brother-in-law and had children by him[8]; this was however not a restricted 'niyoga' in the later sense, as the widow's hand is taken formally, not only for offspring but also for property[9]; and she approaches the 'devṛ' as an ordinary young maiden her lover. It is again not necessarily a 'devṛ' who marries her but anyone who might be a 'didhiṣu'[1]; the widow herself is 'didhiṣū'[2] indicating some exercise of choice on her part, while her second husband is called 'didhiṣū-pati,'[2] and the son of such marriage between two pre-eminently 'didhiṣu (°ṣū)' persons, 'daidhiṣavya.'[2] In fact in other references to widow re-marriage nothing is said about restriction to the first husband's kin or household; in one of them[3] the previous husband is sought to be ignored altogether, and connexion with him cut off in the next world by magical charms,—showing that the 'punarbhū' is here married into a totally different family; in another,[4] a woman might have several husbands one after another, of 'vaiśya,' 'rājanya' or 'brāhmaṇ castes.

---

[1] Ibid. 3. The Sūtra application of this verse to a cow that is killed on the occasion is incredible; v. 4 seems to give social sanction to the act in v. 3; 'gópati' is prob. intended as a pun on 'goptṛ' and 'pati.'

[2] So also in the marriage hymns, all the mantras apparently do not apply to one type of marriage.

[3] Thus there was nothing unusual in Epic-Purāṇic cases like that of Ugrāyudha (Pāñcāla) wanting to marry the widow of Śantanu (Kuru), even before the funeral was over (vide infra),—for that was precisely the custom.

[4] Av. XVIII, 3, 57; Rv. X, 18, 7.

[5] Rv. IV, 18, 12; X, 40, 2; Ṣaḍviṃ. Brā. III. 7; 'vidavā,' (like the masc. form 'vidhava,'—prob. Rv. X, 40, 8) would thus seem only to have designated persons in the temporary condition of bereavement, and not in a permanent state of husbandlessness.

[6] Rv. I. 124, 7 (cf. Nir. III, 5.)

[7] Av. IX, 5, 28.

[8] Cf. n. 1, p. 79.

[9] Vide n. 10, p 82.

It appears that apart from regular widow re-marriages, women could also re-marry on disappearance of the husband[5] or in other circumstances in his life-time[6]; and of the ten previous husbands of the widow whom the Atharvavedic brāhmaṇ is willing to marry as her eleventh and best husband,[7] several must have either left her or been discarded by her for various lawful reasons. The number of re-marriages permissible is nowhere laid down[8]: the custom of 'devṛ'-marriage is no proof for one re-marriage only, for similar transferences may well have occurred more than once; the rite to secure reunion in heaven with the present husband rather than the previous,[9] if at all believed to be effective, would imply similar safeguarding of every fresh re-marriage; while it is remarkable that in a passage intended to glorify the 'brāhmaṇ,'[10] he should be described as willing to be the best husband of a much married widow.[11]

---

[1] (Vide n. 10, p. 82.) This is taken in the Sūtras to include the 'devṛ' and other representatives of the husband, like pupil or slave (vide ante). The older Dh. Sūtras (often embodying later Vedic custom) recognize fully the ordinary widow re-marriage (without restriction of sphere).

[2] Cf. Manu : III, 173; St. Pet. Dict., s.v. 'didhiṣu,' 3; also 'daidhiṣavya' : Taitt. Sam. III, 2, 4, 4; Kāt. Śr. Sūt. II, 1, 22; Kauś. Sūt. 3, 5: 137, 37.

[3] Av. IX, 5, 28.

[4] Av. V, 17, 8.9.

[5] Rv. VI, 49, 8.

[6] Av. IX, 5, 27.28, may also refer to such re-marriage (owing to first husband being fallen or impotent); cf. Baudh. Dh. Sūt. II, 2, 3, 27.

[7] Vide n. 4 above.

[8] It is possible, that the allegory of 3 previous husbands of every bride reflects also (vide p. 80, n. 10 and 11, and p. 81, n. 1) a contemporary view of the average number (4) of re-marriages allowed.

[9] Vide n. 3 above.

[10] Vide n. 4 above.

[11] Which, it is said, was 'well-known to the 5 (Mānava) races'; this is quite in agreement with the known facts, Vedic and Epic-Purāṇic, regarding the character of brāhmaṇ society (vide infra).

Neither of the two different views represented by Zimmer[1] and Weber,[2] regarding the comparative prevalence of monogamy and polygamy in the Vedic age, seems to be a full explanation of the facts. Thus it cannot be maintained that monogamic relations were the normal and prevalent characteristic, for deviations on either side are not rare: e.g., 'sapatnī' is found quite early and often[3]; and apart from indications of polyandry[4] and other references to paramours,[5] it is presumed by a domestic ritual formula in the Rv. that every married woman might have her 'jāra,'[6]—with which may be compared similar presumptions in the Yv. and Brā.○-ritual[7]; this is also confirmed by the remarkable Epic-Purāṇic traditions regarding Śvetaketu and Dīrghatamas' reforms, which would show that amongst the earlier generations of the Vedic priestly society at least, the women were often not 'monogamous.'[8] So again, polygamy, instead of dying out in the early Vedic age, is found all through, and seems to be rather on the increase, preparing the way for a greater laxity and corruption in the succeeding age. Thus 'Manu' himself is credited with ten wives[9]; Cyavāna one of the earliest ṛṣis married a number of maidens in old age,[10] and so did Kākṣīvant the Pajrīya[11] in the latter part of the Ṛgvedic age; while the Vedic prince and his priest who could give and receive scores of slave-girls as wives,[12] were no doubt living in an age of flourishing polygamy. Cases of polygamy (amongst ṛṣis, princes, or even non-Āryan chiefs) are indeed often referred to in the Ṛgveda[13]: in some of which the relations between the several wives (from 2 to at least 8) and the husband ('ekaḥ samānaḥ') are ideally happy, while in others they are recognized as painful. The circumstances of conquest and settlement, and consequent prosperity of the priesthood, must have made polygamy a common thing. It is significant that in the Rv. 'dāsa' is primarily the enemy and only secondarily 'a slave,'[1] but that 'dāsī' is all along the 'slave-girl' from the Av. onwards[2]; this would show that the first slaves were the captured Dāsa women, slave-concubinage developing quite early side by side with the Aryan conquest.[3] In the later Saṃhitās the slave woman is also called 'śūdrā'[4] (probably originally a term of racial significance like 'dasī')[5] and such a 'śūdrā' often rose in the favour of her Āryan master[6] who must have had his Āryan wife or wives.[7] The earlier Brāhmaṇas directly ascribe 'śūdrā' or 'dāsī' concubinage to eminent 'ṛṣi' families (Ṛgvedic as well as more or less contemporary ones), and a 'dāsī- (or śūdrā-) putra,' though subject to natural comments, was nevertheless common enough to be assigned the same position as other ṛṣis and teachers.[8] In the Ṛgvedic texts themselves, female slaves are frequently presented to ṛṣis by their patron princes; thus King Trasadasyu[9] bestowed fifty of them as 'vadhū's on Sobhari-Kāṇva[10]; and in other cases, presents of horses, camels or buffaloes, are embellished by such 'vadhū' slaves along with them[11]; while chariots are described as full of slave-girls.[12] The number of slave-girls kept in single establishments in no way diminished in the next age: thus the Śatapatha knows of as many as four hundred 'anucarī's[13]; and (even) in the Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads the King is attended by five hundred fair women carrying perfumed powders, etc.[1] The presence, increase and distribution of slave women was thus a fertile source of polygamy among princes and priests alike.[2]

---

[1] Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 323.

[2] Weber: Ind. Stud. 5, 222.

[3] Rv. III, 1, 10; 6, 4; cf. I, 105, 8; X, 145, 1. 2. 5; (besides Av. frequently).

[4] Vide ante.

[5] Vide infra.

[6] Rv. X, 162, 5. 6=Av. VIII, 6, 7. 8.

[7] The wife's questioning and confession: Mait. Saṃ. I, 10, 11; Taitt. Sam. I, 8, 3; Taitt. Brā. I, 6, 5, 2; Śat. Brā. II, 5, 2, 20.

[8] Vide n. 1, p. 74.

[9] Mait. Saṃ. I, 5, 8. (Vide infra for Purāṇic notices of the polygamy of Manu and his descendants).

[10] Rv. I, 116, 10; (with Śat. Brā. IV, 1, 5, 1 ff; 10, 13; Jaim. Brā. III, 121 ff); cf. V, 74, 5; and allusions to above in I, 117, 13; 118, 6; VII, 68, 6; 71, 5; X, 39, 4. (These 'kanī's and 'vadhū's were over and above the famous princess Sukanyā). cf. I, 51, 13

[11] Rv. I, 126, 3 (10 'vadhūmant' cars from Svanaya); (Vṛcayā in old age).

[12] Rv. VIII, 19, 36. (Trasadasyu-Paurukutsa and Sobhari-Kāṇva may belong to the earlier part of the Ṛgvedic age; but Pargiter places them in the latter part, distinguishing 2 Purukutsas and 2 Trasadasyus).

[13] Rv. I, 62, 11; 71, 1; 104, 3; 105, 8; 112, 19; 186, 7; VII, 18, 2; 26, 3; X, 43, 1; 101, 11; (It is remarkable that almost all these references to polygamy come from Āṅgirasa and Vāśiṣṭha ṛṣis). Cf. other references in Av. and Yv.: e.g. Av. III, 4; etc., Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 5, 1, 4; etc.

---

[1] Rv. VII, 86, 7; VIII, 56, 3; X, 62, 10; prob. I, 92, 8; 158, 5; VIII, 46, 32; cf. Av. IV, 9, 8.

[2] Av. V, 22, 6; XII, 3, 13; 4, 9; Chānd. Upan. V, 13, 2; Bṛhad. Upan. VI, 1, 10.

[3] Which was probably over before the later Saṃhitās and Brā°., for they do not refer to any Ārya-Dāsa wars, but only to Āryan wars (vide V.I., I, 65).

[4] Av. V, 22, 7; Taitt. Saṃ. VII, 4, 19, 3; Kāṭh. Saṃ. (Aśvamedha), IV, 8; Mait. Saṃ. III, 13, 1; Vāja. Saṃ. XXIII, 30; etc.

[5] Vide V.I., II, 392.

[6] Vide Yv. references in note 4 above.

[7] Who also had connexions with Śūdra slaves: Vāja. Saṃ. XXIII, 31.

[8] E.g. Kākṣivant, son of a slave-girl: Bṛhadd. IV, 11-15; 21-25; with Rv. I, 18, 1; 112, 11; 140-164 (cf. Pañc. Brā. XIV, 11, 16); Kavaṣa, 'dāsyāḥ putraḥ': Ait. Brā. II, 19, 1; Kauṣ. Brā. XII, 1, 3; (Kavaṣa was a Ṛgvedic ṛṣi); Vatsa, 'śūdrā-putra' (a Kāṇva): Pañc. Brā. XIV, 6, 6; cf. Satyakāma Jābāla (about 150 years after the compilation of the Rv.): Chānd. Upan. IV, 4, 1 ff., etc.; also in Bṛhad. Upan., Ait. Brā. and Śat. Brā. (vide details of ref. in V.I., II, 420).

[9] Rv. VIII, 19, 36. Cf. V, 47, 6 ('vadhū's).

[10] Sons by slave-concubines was a special feature in the Kāṇva groups: vide V.I., II, 238.

[11] Rv. VIII, 68, 17; VI, 27, 8; Av. XX, 127, 2.

[12] Rv. I, 126, 3; VII, 18, 22. (These 'vadhū's however might be 'slave' as well as free, from the context).

[13] Sat. Brā. XIII, 5, 4, 27.

Apart from this possession of slave-girls, the princes had at least[3] four principal wives recognized in regal ceremonial and rites, of whom the fourth, the 'pālāgalī,' seems to be a comparatively later development,—or to have been given a place in the ritual somewhat later—in the Brāhmaṇa age; the 'mahiṣī' and the 'parivṛktī' occur from the Ṛgveda onwards[4]; and though the 'vāvātā' first occurs in the Av.,[5] she is implied by the 'parivṛktī'; the 'pālāgalī,' wife of the King is an indication that it was a political marriage,[7] and that daughters of other and higher court officials also were customarily taken into his harem from similar original motives[8]; the first three designations are essentially relative, and pre-suppose a regular harem-establishment, the members of which experienced constant rises and falls ('parivṛkti') in power at court

---

[1] Kauṣ. Upan. I, 4; and corr. passage in Śāṅkh. Āraṇ.

[2] Vide Purāṇic parallels infra.

[3] The King's many wives are referred to in Rv. VII, 18, 2 ('rājêva hi janibhih'); probably 'kṣoṇibhiḥ' in Ṛv. X, 95, 9, refers to Purūravas' other wives besides Urvaśi; cf. Rv. II, 16, 3 (Indra's 'indriya' not overcome by his 'kṣoṇis').

[4] 'Mahiṣī': Rv. V, 2, 2; 37, 3; Av. II, 36, 3; Taitt. Saṃ. I, 8, 9, 1; Mait. Saṃ. II, 6, 5; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XV, 4; Taitt. Brā. III, 9, 4, 4; Pañc. Brā. XIX, 1, 4; Śat. Brā. V, 3, 1, 4; VI, 5, 3, 1, 6; XII, 2, 6, 4; 1, 8; 5, 2, 2. 5. 9; 'parivṛkti,' etc.: Rv. X, 102, 11; Av. VII., 113, 2; XX, 128, 10. 11; Kāṭh. Saṃ. X, 10; XV, 4; Taitt. Saṃ. I, 8, 9, 1; Taitt. Brā. I, 7, 3, 4; Śat. Brā. V, 3, 1, 13; XIII, 2, 6, 6; 4, 1, 8; 5, 2, 7.

[5] Av. XX, 128, 10.11; subsequently in Taitt. Brā. I, 7, 3, 3; III, 9, 4, 4; Ait. Brā. III, 22; Śat. Brā. XIII, 2, 6, 5; 4, 18; 5, 2, 6; in fact the Yv. ceremonial presupposes these 4 chief queens.

[6] Pālāgalī: Taitt. Brā. I, 7, 3, 3 ff; III, 9, 4, 5; Śat. Brā. XIII, 4, 1, 8; Śāṅkh. Śr. Sūt. XVI, 4, 4.

[7] She is the daughter of the lowest court official, probably the chief 'pālāgala' (messenger or spy) (Śat. Brā. V, 3, 1, 11), whose function is aptly described as bearing false news; the motive of taking such an officer's daughter in the harem is quite clear; and as the 'lowest' officer's daughter is a queen, other officers' daughters also must have been favoured, as indeed is evident from the numerous companions of the 4 chief wives (present at the horse-sacrifice) belonging to different ranks. Cf. Aśvamedha sections of Yv. Saṃhitās.

[8] Vide n. 7 above. This is illustrated in Epic tradition also; thus Sumitrā the 'parivṛktī' wife of Daśaratha was the 'purohita' Vāmadeva's daughter by a 'vaiśyā'), and one of (the Matsya king) Virāṭa's queens was a sister of his commander-in-chief Kīcaka. In later literature 'Mahāmātra-sutā's are often taken into the royal harems (cf. Vāts. Kā. Sūt.). The 'vaiśyā wife' so often mentioned in Epic-Purāṇic tradition, is probably the daughter of the 'Grāmaṇi' of the king's court, while the 'śūdrā wife is the daughter of the Pālāgala or lowest court official, the spy-messenger.

('mahiṣī') or in personal favour with the prince ('vāvātā').[1] Such rise and fall is well depicted in the chief wife's song of triumph,[2] where she congratulates herself on the dawn of her fortunes, subjugation of rival wives and influence over the heroic lord with whom her name stands highest, and through whom she rules all the people,—on her sons rising to the rank of mighty warriors and daughters to that of princesses.

This threefold classification seems to have been a general one, and not confined to consorts of princes: thus a domestic mantra wishes that a maiden might after marriage become a mother of sons, and thereby become a 'mahiṣī'[3]; while the rivalry between the 'vāvātā' and 'parivṛktī' wives forms the subject of many other domestic magical rites.[4] Three wives then would appear to have been a common average, almost a minimum for the Vedic polygamist householder, though two wives are mentioned once in the Ṛv.[5]; so also, in some early Brāhmaṇas, mention is made of the sons of one's father's eldest wife and youngest wife ('jaiṣṭhineya' and 'kāniṣṭhineya').[6] In a passage of the marriage hymns *several* young maidens are said to be eagerly proceeding to a husband's home from their father's (or fathers'),[7] where the reference evidently is to one man marrying several sisters or otherwise related women at the same time. With the Yajurvedic brāhmaṇ indeed, "many wives" was an apparently established custom.[8] Of a man's several wives one at least must often have been the widow of a brother or kinsman, from the customary character of such transference.[9] Apart from these regular wives, the example of slave-concubinage amongst princes and their client priests[10] must have influenced ordinary society; the references to Ārya-Śūdrā unions in the Yv. Saṃhitās is rather general, and might imply that slave-women were glad to be wives of *any* Ārya whether rich or poor[11] (for obvious advantages); the employment of 'dāsī's or

---

[1] Here also the Epics afford interesting illustration, e.g. in the changing relations between Daśaratha's 3 wives and Kṛṣṇa's many wives (at least two of whom were 'mahiṣī' by turns, and 3 'vāvātā').

[2] Ṛv. X, 159.

[3] Av. II, 36, 3.

[4] Av. III, 18; VII, 35; Ṛv. X, 145.

[5] Ṛv. X, 101, 11.

[6] Taitt. Brā. II, 1, 8, 1; Pañc. Brā. II, 1, 2; XX, 5, 2.

[7] Av. XIV, 2, 52.

[8] Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 5, 1, 4 (tasmāt eko vahvīr jāyā vindate).

[9] Vide ante.

[10] Vide ante.

[11] For when a Śūdrā became the beloved of her Ārya lord, she did not care about wealth, etc.: vide Aśvamedha sections of Yv. Saṃhitās (and n. 6, p. 86).

‘ śūdrā ’s as ‘ anūcarī ’s and ‘ pariveṣṭrī ’s[1] must have become a common item of style; even the ordinary brāhmaṇ sacrificer, while placing five conical bricks[2] on his fire-altar, hoped to obtain in the next world five fair ‘ asparas’es as his personal attendants, bodyguards and ‘ embracers,’[3]—evidently the heavenly counterparts of his humbler establishment; it is also probable that already in the Vedic marriage the ‘ nyocanī ’[4] refers to a companion slave-girl given away along with the bride,—a very ancient custom ascribed to some of the earliest royal marriages in Epic-Purāṇic tradition.[5]

While however ‘ a general prevalence of monogamy ’ or the ‘ dying out of polygamy ’ are not borne out by such facts and indications, it is reasonable to hold that as polygamy must always, in the absence of universal regulations, be secondary with communities, tending to appear or disappear according to variation of circumstances, it has had this history in ancient India. Thus it may well have existed in the primitive tribal stage of the Āryans, when large numbers of women of subordinated kindred or enemy groups may have been transferred to mighty horde-leaders or patriarchs[6]; it would develop with the extermination or assimilation of the Dāsas[7] of the plains in the early Vedic period; it would become a fashion subsequently with the growth of an opulent ruling nobility and their favoured priesthood,[8] or be inevitable with the progress of internecine fighting[9]; it may have been adopted in the earliest times from pre-existing non-Āryan princes and priests.[10] But between these secondary developments of the Vedic age a monogamistic tendency seems to have been always present,[1] and the persistence of this ideal is discernible through all the fluctuations of subsequent periods. In this matter indeed, ancient Indian society has developed and changed unfettered by any external commandment or ruling (unlike society in Europe and the Middle East, where a monogamic and a polygamic character, respectively, has practically been imposed by Christianity and Islam); and prevalence of polygamy or monogamy for any particular period or region has depended on various communal, economic and political conditions, and the state of public opinion or individual ideals. Thus it is intelligible how side by side with instances of polygamy and laxity, monogamy is evidently approved in the Ṛgveda as an ideal[2]; constancy of conjugal affections is earnestly sought for equally by men and women[3]; while a large portion of the wedding-hymns (scarcely surpassed by any other nuptial formulæ for simple yet noble ideas) regard the marriage-tie with reverence, and, practically ignoring polygamy, emphasise mutual conjugal fidelity, poetically typified[4] in the 'cakravāka' pair.

---

[1] Vide n. 13, p. 86; Śat. Brā. XI, 2, 7, 4; Kauṣ. Upan. II, 1; Keith: Śāṅkh. Āraṇ., 21, n. 2.

[2] A curious parallel to this association of ideas is to be found in the “ barī ”-wives of ‘ baby ’ in Bengali household idiom.

[3] Taitt. Sāṃ. V, 3, 7, etc.

[4] Av. XIV, 1, 7=Rv. X, 85, 6; being classed with ‘ anudeyī,’ it must mean companion-maid (represented by the ‘ jhi ’ or ‘ dāsī ’ of even modern times), rather than any ornament or special type of song.

[5] E.g. Śarmiṣṭhā and her maids given away to Yayāti along with Devayānī; or similar gifts in the case of Draupadī and Subhadrā’s marriages. Vide infra.

[6] The case of Manu’s 10 wives would fall under this head; for Purāṇic instances of the polygamy of such early chiefs (like Dakṣa, Kaśyapa, Manu, Ikṣvāku, etc.) vide infra.

[7] Cf. pp. 85—87 above.

[8] Cf. pp. 85—87 above.

[9] This is fully illustrated by Epic-Purāṇic instances : vide infra.

[10] This probability becomes almost a certainty when some of the ‘ traditional ’ instances of polygamy are critically viewed : vide infra.

---

[1] Cf. the use of 'patnī' in the singular; and the recognition of only one full wife in ritual (patnī) or at royal court (mahiṣī).

[2] Rv. I, 124, 7; IV, 3, 2; X, 71, 4; etc. (apart from the marriage hymns).

[3] E.g. Av. II, 30, 2. 5; 36, 4; VI, 139; VII, 36; 37; 38; cf. VI, 102; 130; 131; 132; (apart from the marriage hymns).

[4] Av. XIV, 2, 64.

FEATURES OF THE NORMAL MARRIAGE-FORMS

The Vedic marriage is a natural and a real one, with little of the rigidity and artificiality of the later 'Hindu' forms. The only possible (?) reference to an early marriage is in an Upaniṣad, where a poor brāhmaṇ teacher adopts the life of a beggar with his 'āṭikī' wife[1]: the medieval commentators give 'āṭikī' a fanciful special sense,—of 'ajāta-payodharā, etc.,'—which evidently reflects their own dislike[2] of the idea that a brāhmaṇ teacher's youthful wife should go about freely; if it is not a proper name, and has to be taken as an adjective, the only rational sense would be 'fit for or used to a wandering life,' i.e., hardy and patient[3]. Child-wives are first mentioned in the Sūtras[4]; and there the gradual growth of the practice may be clearly traced, from its beginnings in the time of Āśval. and Hiraṇ. Sūtras onwards; even then child-marriage had not become a general rule.[5] This 'legal' Sūtra evidence is borne out by the (post-Mauryan) Vāts. 'Kāma'-Sūtra, which ignores child-marriages altogether, recognizing in special cases juvenile attachments and wooings only.[6] It seems probable that this subsequent cropping up and development of child-marriage as a practice was due to a certain amount of insecurity of society[7] in the earlier and latter parts of the 'Sūtra period,' between cir. 550 and 320 B.C., and from 220 B.C. onwards, as a result of Persian and Macedonian conquests, and Graeco-Bactrian, Parthian, Scythic and Kuṣāṇ invasions, respectively.[8]

In the earlier Vedic period, the obligatory marriage of a girl, before a certain age, and irrespective of all other considerations, was unknown.[9] Thus, forward younger sisters might get married in advance while the elder still waited for her chances in love[1]; cases of unmarried young women staying on with their father, and even growing old (or dying unmarried)[2] in the paternal home, were not unusual,[3]—though an old maid was regarded as rather unfortunate, eliciting ironical remarks (e.g., being called Yama's 'Kulapā,'[4] or 'sitting long with the Fathers'), and maidens cursed their rivals in love with hated spinsterhood.[6]

---

[1] Chānd. Upan. I, 10, 1.

[2] Acquired in dissimilar social and political circumstances.

[3] The S.B.E. however, adopts the view of the commentators. It seems permissible to see in 'ātikī' a reference to 'itinerant' women teachers (married or otherwise: vide infra.), who are also well known to Epic-Purāṇic tradition. Cf. the Vedic 'Iṭant' or 'Iṭa' ṛṣis and the 'yāyāvara's.

[4] Cf. Jolly: Recht und Sitte: 59; Hopkins: J. Am. Or. S., 13, 340 ff; 23, 356.

[5] Bhāṇḍārkar: Z.D.M.G. 47, 143-156 (in review of Jolly: ibid. 46, 413-426).

[6] Cf. specially, Vāts. Kā. Sūt. III, *re* "wooing of the 'kanyā'."

[7] It is well-known that early marriage became general in medieval India largely owing to the Mahomedan occupation of the country.

[8] Subsequently, however, child-marriage must have fallen into disuse, specially during the Gupta period (as the evidence of Gupta literature generally shows); it would revive again with the collapse of Indian polity before the invasions of the 6th and 7th centuries; and before a full restoration of normal forms, the special feature would be confirmed by Mahomedan invasions and subsequent occupation.

[9] Except possibly in the case of royal alliances, where occasional early marriages may have taken place, naturally enough. Vide infra. *re* indications of it in 'tradition'.

The early Vedic texts[7] know of mutual affection developing between the youth and the maid. Thus, the love-led maiden (jāriṇī) goes to her tryst, with as strong a passion as that of the gambler for his dice[8]; the river offers an easy ford, as a 'kanyā' bends herself to receive her 'marya's' embrace[9]; the young woman woos and attends her dear lover,[10] and the fingers press the 'Soma' as a 'kanyā' caresses her lover.[11] Young people dream of the co-mingling of body, intents and conduct, of the woman desiring a husband and the man desiring a wife coming together in joy and blessedness[12]; parents wish that their marriageable girl may find a husband according to her wish and choice and responsive to her love,[13] and at the same time be enjoyed by, dear to, and concordant with him[14]; and with couples about to be married, the eyes of both are of honey-aspect,[15] their faces ointment, they are put within one another's heart, and their minds are together.[16]

On *either* side the yearning described is that of persons in the fulness of youth. Thus, the sun follows the dawn like a youthful lover after an attractive woman[17]; Indra is coaxed as a confident lover proud of his 'yoṣā' coaxes her[18] the youth imagines his chosen girl as pierced with Kāma's shafts (feathered with longing, tipped with love, necked with resolve, consuming, humbling, etc.), so that impelled away from her parents, and leaving her cosy couch, she comes to him creeping, gentle and sweet, and entirely his[1]; he wants her to burn and dry up with desire for every limb of his, lust after him, and cling to his arm and heart[2]; on the other hand, the maiden also wants her man to think of, pine for, and be mad after her,—while she would not fall in such plight herself, though he is dear to her[3]; in fact the young man often loses his head and makes a present of all his belongings to his girl[4]; she too, believing that it is after the manner of the gods themselves, and in accordance with Varuṇa's 'dharma,' boldly kindles the flame of burning love.[5]

---

[1] Vide infra.

[2] This was not a dreaded fate in early Vedic estimation: cf. Av. XVIII, 2, 47.

[3] Rv. I, 117, 7; II, 17, 7; X, 39, 3; 40, 5; Av. I, 14.

[4] I.e. 'mistress of Pluto's household'; similar remarks are still in use in vern. idioms.

[5] In a double sense.

[6] Av. I, 14, 3.

[7] In the following lines the original texts have simply been paraphrased.

[8] Rv. X, 34, 5; cf. 40, 6.

[9] Rv. III, 33, 10.

[10] Rv. IX, 32, 5.

[11] Rv. IX, 56, 3.

[12] Av. II, 30, 2-3. ('spouse-finder' mantras).

[13] An oft-repeated phrase.

[14] Av. II, 36, 4.5 (etc.); cf. VI, 60, 3.

[15] Cf. Av. I, 34 (emphasising 'sweet' relations).

[16] Av., VII, 36; cf. VI 102 (moving together like a king-horse and a side-mare).

[17] Rv., I, 115, 2.

[18] Rv., IV, 20, 5.

On *either* side, again, strong jealousy is felt in love-affairs, and wandering affections are anxiously sought to be recalled,—which shows much freedom of intercourse. Thus rival maidens cursed one another ceremonially with spinsterhood,[6]—and malicious rites were performed by men also against their rivals[7]; when going abroad, the young man is reminded by his sweetheart that he is wholly hers, must never even mention any other woman, and must return to her even from beyond unknown lands and streams,—and he must not say anything against this prayer of hers, for a man's talk suits only the assembly, but he is to be quiet before his sweetheart[8]; when the lover has actually left her, she still wants him to long for her with his whole body, come back to her and be the father of her sons, though he may have run 5 leagues away, or a horseman's day's journey[9]; and the jealousy of rivals in love is reflected in the rite where the bride symbolically binds her groom with her hair to make him wholly hers, so that he may not henceforward even name another woman[10]; on the other hand when the maiden proved inconstant, her jilted lover earnestly hoped that she might yet dry up in heart and mouth by loving him, and that estranged hearts might nevertheless be joined together and made the same.[1]

---

[1] Av. III, 25.

[2] Av. VI, 9; cf. VI, 139 and VI, 8.

[3] Av. VI, 130.

[4] Rv. I, 117, 18.

[5] Av. VI, 132.

[6] Av. I, 14. The rite for barrenness of a rival woman might also have been performed by such jealous maidens; cf. Av. VII, 35; also VII, 113 (mutilation).

[7] Cf. Av. VI, 138; VII, 90 (inducing impotence; performed also against wife's paramour).

[8] Av. VII, 38 (might also be used by wives); Whitney refers to "Burmese" parallels of the 'thread-tie'; but cf. the well-known 'rākhī' throughout the "Gangetic" country.

[9] Av. VI, 131.

[10] Av. VII, 37.

Apart from these plain descriptions, the very fact that there were regular domestic rites (with charms and magic potions)[2] calculated to help in all the momentous stages of the progress of love-affairs,[3] and that even the guardians of maidens took part in some of them,[4] shows that free love-makings between young men and women before marriage, was fully recognized in ordinary society.

Good opportunities were afforded for these pre-marital loves in the Vedic festivals. The ritual of the Mahāvrata[5] shows that it was the Brāhmaṇical counterpart of some popular spring festival,[6] wherein there was much of song and dance, swinging and free intermingling of men and women, running into the extremes of promiscuity.[7] But apart from such orgies, there was the more decent[8] group of mixed gatherings called ' Samana's,[9] where the most prominent feature was the wooings of lovers with a view to matrimony,[10] and the lighter pleasures of the company of the fair sex in their most agreeable mood and choicest attire,[4]—though events like poetic contests,[1] tournaments,[2] horse-races,[3] or weddings,[4] may have served as occasions for the gatherings.[5] The fire-lit night[6] of such 'Samana's witnessed, among many other gay and knightly scenes,[7] those of young women ('kumārī's enjoyable to suitors) making love,[8] and heavily adorned old maids ('agruvaḥ') seriously in quest of a husband.[9] Among these young and elderly women must have been the 'agre-didhiṣū,' or the younger sister who anxious to marry would not wait[10] for her elder sister,—the 'didhiṣū,' the less lucky elder sister knowing better rather late,[11] or the widow wooing afresh 'maryaṃ na yoṣā,'[12]—as well as the spinster growing old at home and staying with her father,[13] and the forward brotherless girl.[14]

---

[1] Av. VI, 139.

[2] Some of these rites have been indicated in the above references.

[3] Viz., acquaintance, growth of love, secret visits, jealousy, estrangement, reunion, etc.

[4] E.g. Av. II, 36; VI, 60.

[5] Vide the ' Mahāvrata ' sections in Yv. Saṃhitās.

[6] Cf. Keith : Śāṅkh. Āraṇ., *re* the Mahāvrata.

[7] This may have been the prototype of the classical Hallīsaka and Lāṭarāsaka, mentioned in Vāts. Kā. Sūt. as specially suited for courtships in polite circles,—and of the more vulgar (?) medieval and modern Holī (Holākā, Dol, etc.). and Rāsa (Jhulan, etc.). But the inclusion of martial features in the Mahāvrata, and the sort of drum and dancing described, rather point to some Dravido-Kolārian affinities; cf. the seasonal orgies of the N.-E. Deccān tribes; the extremes of licentiousness (bhūtānāṃ maithunaṃ) are common to these as well as to the other group of festivals.

[8] Not always,—for the sessions sometimes lasted the whole night, and girls spent the night out there; besides courtesans also took advantage of these ' Samana's. (Rv. I. 124, 8; cf. 126, 5; brilliant ' vrā's attending the Samana; ' viśyāḥ vrāḥ ' with many associates).

[9] Probably the ' Samana ' was primarily a seasonal festival, at the beginning of the ' samā ' or summer, which came to serve as the occasion for various social functions (just as even now marriages mostly take place in the months wherein the Vasanta-Pañcami and Holī fall). Indrāṇī (a sex goddess) was worshipped by women at these Samanas according to ancient custom : Rv. X, 86. 10.

[10] Av. II. 36, 1 (agreeable and enjoyable to suitors); Rv. VII, 2, 5 (adorned all over); Rv. IV, 58, 8 (amorous, smiling. auspicious, etc.); etc.

Such social freedom is characteristic of the early Vedic period, seclusion of women being unknown; even after marriage, wives, who ordinarily move about well-adorned within the house, often came out to the Sabhā.[1] The maidens growing up in their father's home mixed freely with the youth of the village,[2] and with them joined in the rustic music and swings under the spreading banyan-trees[3]; the virile young man ('marya') is normally a lover, constantly in the company of youthful maidens ('yuvati,' etc.),[4] and, like the latter, affects bright and attractive costumes[5] to enhance his 'marya-śrī' ('lover's grace')[6]; on the other hand, the young maiden is also fully engaged in the midst of a number of suitors,[7] trying her best to please and attract them at the Samana,[7] on the ferry-boat,[7] or at home,[7]—turning her right side to every responsive suitor[7]; she meets her chosen lover at trysts,[8] and lies only half asleep at night, expecting him to come and awaken her[9]; the bold youth also secretly visits his lady-love in her own chamber late in the night, while all her kinsmen are asleep, remaining with her till dawn.[9]

---

[1] Possibly dramatic dialogues (sampled in the Rv.) were also acted in these Samanas; a piece like Purūravas-Urvaśī or Yama-Yamī would be particularly suited for such audience (the later 'Yātrā' 'Kavi-gān,' etc., represents the Samana in this aspect).

[2] Such contests were probably followed or occasioned by 'svayaṃvaras', as frequently in the Epics and Purāṇas; cf. 'samanartiṣū' in Av. XIV, 2, 59 ff, where mock fighting (for the bride) at the Samana or marriage assembly is referred to (vide infra). In the Epic pure tournaments also are attended by ladies who have seats in high galleries.

[3] Cf Rv. X, 168, 2, where mares at the Samana run with the Wind who rides on them like an universal king.

[4] Av. VI, 60, 2 (cf. XIV, 2, 59 ff.) ('Samana' here may mean a 'svayaṃvara' assembly as well); maidens 'toiled to attend these' to help their own cause.

[5] The Samanas have been compared to Greek festivals; ancient festivals are naturally more or less similar; but the parallel of Dravido-Kolārian festivals is at least equally striking, and 'nearer home.' There is in them the same martial elements, free love-makings and excesses, marriages by capture and mock-fights, all-night revelries, and a remarkable passion for attending them in choicest attire, with young men and women alike; all the 'Samana imagery' in Vedic literature can be applied equally to a festival like the 'Kol-yātrā'. The Greek festivals also were based on earlier non-Indo-European institutions.

[6] Rv. I. 48, 6 (Dawn dispersing the Samana); VII, 9, 4 (fire blazing bright at the Samana like the sun); cf. X, 69, 11.

[7] Cf. Pischel: Ved. Stud. II, 314.

[8] Av. II, 36, 1.

[9] Rv. VII, 2, 5.

[10] Vāja Saṃ. XXX, 9; cf. Vāś. Dh. Sūt. XX, 7 ff.

[11] Cf. Vāś. Dh. Sūt. I, 18; Viṣ. Dh. Sūt. XXIV, 40 ('kuryāt svayaṃvaram'); Kullūka on Manu. III, 160 and comm. on Āpast. Dh. Sūt. II, 5, 12, 22.

[12] Cf. Rv. X, 40, 2; ref. to in Manu. III. 173; vide St. Pet. Dict., s. v. 'didhiṣu', 3

[13] Vide ante.

[14] Rv. I, 124, 4. 7; Av. I, 17, 1 (in red garments); cf. Rv. IV, 5, 5.

Thus it is only to be expected that the early marriage ritual also presupposes that the married pair are grown up enough[10] to be lovers, man and wife, and parents of children, and to begin a full home life of their own[11]; almost at every step of that ritual, formulæ are repeated showing their immediate fitness for procreation[12]; and 'handgrasping' and consummation are the essential parts of the Vedic marriage.[12]

---

[1] Rv. I, 167, 3.

[2] V.I., II, 485.

[3] Av. IV, 37, 3-5; the green and white swings (i.e., festooned with leaves and flowers), the music of cymbals and lutes, or the crests of peacock-plumes, ascribed to Gandharvas and Apsarases, under the Aśvattha and Nyagrodha, can only be a reflection of ordinary village merry-makings.

[4] Rv. III, 31, 7; 33, 10 (embracing 'kanyā'); IV, 20, 5 (flattering 'yoṣā'); IX, 96, 20; etc.

[5] Rv. IX, 96, 20.

[6] Rv. II, 10, 5 (in enviable colours).

[7] Av. II, 36; etc.

[8] Rv. X, 34, 5; etc.

[9] Rv. I, 134, 3.

[10] 'Uninjured and unexhausted': Rev. VIII, 55, 5-8 = Av. IV, 5. This formal rite would show that such clandestine meetings were common and connived at in society.

[11] Cf. 'pati-vedanau' ('spouse-finders' = the breasts): Av. VIII, 6, 1. Some Gṛh. Sūtras (acquainted with the later practice of child-marriage) plainly declare the Vedic marriage-ritual to be unsuitable, being meant for adults only; but even for that period, cf. the essential qualification of the bride in Vāts. Kā. Sūt.,—'stani.'

[12] Rv. X, 85; Av. XIV, 1 and 2. It is not improbable that several passages in the marriage mantras (Av. XIV, 2, 22-24) really refer to a legalising marriage after the woman has borne a son, who also is thus given the rights of primogeniture.

Fully in accord with these features, there is little trace of any real parental control[1] over such mature marriages. The later custom of parental sanction would become a necessity only as child-marriage became frequent. It is however probable, from the cases of Śyāvāśva and Vimada, that such control where it existed was more a characteristic of the Vedic ruling nobility (for obvious reasons) than of the Vedic priesthood,[2] which seems to have been generally indifferent to such eugenic considerations. Parents had to submit themselves to their new daughter-in-law's rule, she becoming at once the 'empress' of the household[3]: this position she could hardly have attained if the son was normally married at the dictation of his parents to a 'given away' girl. There is no evidence that the son's marriage could be legally controlled by the father, and not much of it in the case of the daughter.[4] But parents often had a share in arranging suitable matches, as Arcanānas had,[5] acting as a 'vara' or intermediary[6] in the wooing of his son Śyāvāśva who could not hope to succeed all by himself; so also the mother seems to have had a share (amounting sometimes to control) in the selection of a husband for her daughter, whom she helped in her toilet to make her acceptable[7] to suitors; Rathavīti Dālbhya's queen objected to her daughter's marriage with Śyāvāśva (though the king was quite willing) insisting that her son-in-law must be a poet, so that the rejected candidate had to become one[8]; the gambler in the Ṛgveda counts it a great misfortune to have lost the favour of his mother-in-law,[9] which may have given him his wife. But sometimes an ardent but otherwise undesirable suitor ('vijāmātṛ') had to please the father by heavy payments for his bride[10]; or conversely, if a maiden had any defect or was unable to secure a husband herself, her brother (the generous 'śyāla') would offer a dowry for her marriage.[11] The brother was indeed largely responsible[12] for the sister's settlement in life; but besides providing a dowry in special cases, he seems only to have exercised a general supervision over his sister's love-makings,—for it is considered a bad thing to take advantage of defenceless brotherless girls[1]: which shows that girls with brothers were to some extent guided in their social intercourse. Sometimes, again, a father could make a gift of his daughter to someone for services rendered, as in the case of Cyavāna or Śyāvāśva[2]; or in special cases he could stipulate for his daughter's remaining with him after marriage and bearing sons for his family only.[3] These facts show some amount of control over the daughter's marriage, who could, under exceptional circumstances, 'be sold,' given away in arranged marriage, or bestowed as a gift; but if the daughter liked, she could go definitely against her father's wishes, and be appreciated for that, as in the case of Kamadyu, daughter of Purumitra, who practically eloped with Vimada.

---

[1] Cf. Delbrück: Ind. Ver., 574, 576, 582; Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 309 (opp. but not clear); but cf. Jaim. Upan. Brā. III, 12, 2.

[2] With this feature may be compared the comparatively greater prevalence of widow-burning and conjugal fidelity amongst the ruling nobility of the earliest times as shown by instances in 'tradition.'

[3] Rv. X, 85, 46; Av. XIV, 2, 26; cf. Ait. Brā. III, 37.

[4] Cf. V.I., I, 527.

[5] Bṛhadd. V, 49 ff.

[6] Rv. X, 78, 4; 85, 15.23; vide n. 5 above.

[7] Rv. I, 123, 11; Av. II, 36; etc.

[8] Rv. V, 61, etc., with Bṛhadd. V, 49 ff.

[9] Rv. X, 34, 3.

[10] Rv. I, 109, 2; VIII, 2, 20; Mait. Saṃ. I, 10, 11; Taitt. Saṃ. II, 3, 4, 1; Kāth. Saṃ. XXXVI, 5; Taitt. Brā. I, 1, 2, 4; (cf. Nir. VI, 9; Manu. III, 53; VIII, 204; IX, 98).

[11] Rv. VI, 28, 5; X, 27, 12; Av. V, 17, 12; Rv. I, 109, 2 (śyāla); X, 85, 6 (anudevī).

[12] Cf. Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 328.

The so-called marriage hymns are rather tesselated pieces (as already noted).[5] A number of features mentioned in them contradict one another, or do not fit in;—though later Sūtras have tried their best to use these passages to suit contemporary ritual, often obviously misapplying them.[6] Thus some of them refer to the bride's being first escorted as a 'kumārī,' from her father's house to her future home in procession, where the marriage and its consummation takes place,[7] while others might refer to the 'wedded' bride being so carried in procession[8]; some refer to eager and favourable brides,[9] others, to wailings of the bride and other women in the house,[10]—which evidently refers to a mock-ceremonial attending the 'Rākṣasa' form of marriage by capture of a wailing woman[11] (supposed to make the bride and her sisters, friends and relatives, miserable) ; some can only apply to polyandry, to polygamy, or to sister-marriage,[1] while others apply to normal forms; and at least two of the passages show traces of having once been part of some older Dravidian ritual.[2] Hence it is not safe to take them as describing in detail and in order any *one* form of standard marriage-ritual; though some of their features may well have been common to all forms and constituted the special act of marriage: like the taking of the bride's hand,[3] the circumambulation of the household fire,[4] or the consummation before or after home-coming (with connected rites) [5]

---

[1] Rv. IV, 5, 5.

[2] Jaim. Brā. III, 12, 2; Bṛhadd. V, 49 ff.

[3] Rv. III, 31, 1.

[4] Rv. I. 112. 19; 116. 1; 117. 20; X, 39, 7; 65, 12.

[5] Vide ante: sec. *re* polyandry.

[6] As in generally applying evidently polyandric forms, with the absurd result that a normal wife is called 'devṛ-kāmā,' and ascribed several husbands and consummations; or, as with the funeral mantras (vide secs. *re* widow-remarriage and 'śmaśānas'), where passages relating to widow-burning are used of a cow, and those referring to erection of mounds are applied to digging out.

[7] Av. XIV, 1, 62-63, with XIV, 2. first part, sp. 6-19; probably also XIV. 1. 6-22.

[8] Av. XIV, 1, 61; 2, 74

[9] Av. XIV. 1. 9-31: 2. 52; etc.

[10] Av. XIV, 2. 59-61.

[11] The passage becomes perfectly intelligible and appropriate if 'sama-nartiṣu' is analysed as 'samana-ṛtiṣū' ('in wedding assembly combats') instead of 'sama-nartiṣū' ('co-dancings') with Whitney. It cannot very well be supposed that funeral mantras have been inserted in the midst of marriage formulæ. Neither Whitney and Roth's Index to the Av., nor Roth's Dict. notices this important word. 'Ṛti'=combat is a very common word

Apart from these optional forms of ritual (associated with extraordinary types of marriage and traces of different tribal customs), more of variety have been introduced by the different manners in which marriages were settled. The part of the 'bride-wooers' in several passages of the marriage-hymns shows that often alliances were negotiated[6] by intermediaries (who were either friends and near relatives of the bridegroom, or professional match-makers)[7]; yet, generally the bride herself is approached and won over by favourable representations about her suitor, and she eagerly approves of the match.[8] Indeed in Ṛgvedic opinion,[9] that 'vadhū' alone is 'bhadrā,' who, brilliantly attired, herself selects her mate ('friend') even in the midst of an assembly, though it is at the same

---

in Vedic texts. 'Samanarti' thus accurately describes the conflicts at Svayaṃvaras and forcible carrying off of brides from the marriage-assembly, so amply illustrated in ancient 'traditional' accounts; from real wailings (with dishevelled hair) of the bride's 'janāh', 'jāmis' and other 'yuvatis', a formal ceremony could develop as a survival, and it is apparently this that is referred to in the above passage.

[1] Vide ante, secs. *re* polyandry, polygamy and sister-marriage.

[2] Av. XIV, 2, 19; 63; in the former the bride as the new mistress of the house addresses the house or its spirit as 'Iḍe', which can only stand for the Dravidian 'iḍa' and cognate words meaning homestead; in the latter the bride scatters 'pulya', which again represents the Dravidian 'puḷi' (cf. Prākṛta 'pulla' and mod vern. 'muḍi.'

[3] Av. XIV, 1, 51; Rv. X, 18, 8.

[4] In the Gṛh. Sūtras.

[5] Which together take up a large part of the Rv. and Av. marriage hymns.

[6] Av. XIV. 1. 8.9: 31; 2. 66; VI. 60. 1; etc.

[7] Thus in Syāvāśva's case the 'vara' was his father, while the 'aryaman' who is busy finding out wife for the wifeless and husband for the spinster (Av. VI. 60, 1) is evidently a professional 'ghaṭaka.' In the Vāts. Kā. Sūt., the 'varas' are still near relatives or friends of the suitor, but the 'varaṇa' system is disparaged, preference being given to the 'Gāndharva' where 'varas' are needless. (Probably it is through the 'varaṇa' being thus often personally done by the suitor that in later use 'vara' has come to mean the bridegroom himself).

[8] Av XIV. 1. 8.9; 31; VI. 60, 2.3; etc. So also, the 'kanyā' adorns herself with ornaments, eager to come to her 'vahatu': Rv IV, 58, 9.

[9] Rv. X, 27, 12.

time recognized that many young women have to appear pleasing unto suitors anxious to wed them for their fortunes. The most usual type of marriage-alliance seems to have been that in which the bride and bridegroom had previously come to enjoy one another's company,—in their ordinary village life,[1] or in various opportune festive gatherings,[2]—and in which their free choice (made amongst a number of suitors and husband-seekers) and mutual attachment (growing through stages of estrangement, jealousies, wanderings and longings, and fostered by magic rites) had been approved as a matter of course by their kinsmen,[3] who joined in the festivities[4]: a smooth and happy sort of affair with nothing rigid and unnatural in it.[5] But sometimes the lovers came into conflict with their guardians, and the marriage had to be accomplished by capture and elopement, which was regarded as a commendable step for the knight and the lady alike; thus in the case of Vimada and Purumitra's daughter, it appears that there was no violence pure and simple,[6] but that the affair was pre-arranged with the consent of the fair lady who refused to be guided by her father. This previous mutual consent is a noteworthy fact, as being present both in marriages by 'capture' and those by 'gift.'[7] The gift of a maiden in marriage for services rendered is another exceptional form; but other elements sometimes clothe its bareness: thus in the case of Rathavīti-Dālbhya's daughter, Śyāvāśva was at the same time an ardent suitor for the maiden subsequently 'given' to him. Priests very often received, from their princely patrons, noble maidens or slave-girls, for services at sacrifices, who are termed 'vadhū's (either wedded or 'wedable' girls, or simply those 'borne away' as presents on cars)[8]; but this does not appear to have involved any proper marriage, and is to be regarded as concubinage associated with polygamy, developing amongst certain opulent and powerful classes. Sometimes again, bargains were struck, and the bride was practically sold for a heavy price, or the bridegroom purchased by offer of dowry; but the former was considered discreditable to the bridegroom, the latter creditable for the bride's relatives; and both practices were resorted to in exceptional cases only, where, of the suitor and the bride, one had some undesirable defects.

---

[1] Vide pp. 95 and 96 above.

[2] Vide pp. 94 and 95 above.

[3] E.g. Av. II, 36 shows that parents usually left the daughter free in these respects, and directly encouraged her in being forward in love affairs. (So also, even in her childhood her mother thinks of the time when the daughter's developed youth ('pativedanau') would win a husband for her).

[4] Rv. IV, 58, 9; Av. XIV, 2, 59.

[5] This is the type of marriage-alliance which, centuries later, is specially recommended as the best form, and treated as normally prevalent (in spite of the dicta of the law-books), in the Vāts. Kā. Sūt., under the technical name of 'gāndharva.' This treatise closely follows the Vedic notions about sex-relations, and represents conditions somewhat different from those in the law-codes.

[6] Marriages by forcible capture were of course known; vide ante.

[7] Such an element is also emphasised in the Vāts. Kā. Sūt. in these two forms.

[8] Vide ante, sec. *re* polygamy.

In agreement with the generally free character of the Vedic marriage, is the absence of any great restrictions on marriage outside or within certain spheres. There is no ban on marriages within the same group of agnates and cognates; and the several classes, Āryan as well as Dāsa, can intermarry. Sister-marriage, however, was apparently falling into disuse towards the close of the Ṛgvedic period[1]; but even in the subsequent Brāhmaṇa period the restrictions on 'sagotra' and 'sapiṇḍa' marriages did not go beyond the third or fourth generation on either side[2]; and first cousins, through mother's brother or father's sister, could marry,[3] amongst several sections of the people,—marriage with a paternal uncle's daughter being more in use[4]; the restrictions grow more and more marked later on in the Sūtra period[5]; it is thus quite clear that they amounted to very little in the Vedic age proper.

So also, intermarriage between the several 'varṇas' was much easier. It is indeed inconceivable how young men and women could have been allowed free social intercourse in public gatherings or in private company, if there were any real bars to such intermarriage. This may have taken the form of hypergamy oftener. A Yv. Saṃhitā, however, mentions the 'ayogū,'[6] which, if it is connected with the later 'āyogava,' may mean the Āryā woman (vaiśyā) married to a Śūdra[6]; the evidently old tradition recorded in the Āśvalāyana Sūtra, that equally with the 'devṛ,' the family slave ('dāsa') could lawfully marry the widow of his master,[7] is a clearer fact for the early Vedic period; the Yv. Saṃhitās also refer to frequent cases of Śūdra-Āryā connexions,[8] which points to the beginning of such intermixture in the earlier period; in an Atharvavedic charm directed against a rival lover (or a wife's paramour) he is referred to as a 'dāsa,' winning her love by sheer physical strength. On the other hand, men of the Ṛgvedic priestly class are often stated to have married into royal families, as Cyavāna, Śyāvāśva, or Vimada did.[1] Probably this apparent prominence of hypergamy is due to the notices coming from the brāhmaṇs, who have naturally passed over 'rājanyas' who married brāhmaṇ women: still there is the clear case of King Svanaya-Bhāvayavya's beloved wife who was an Āṅgirasī.[2] The Atharva-veda glorifies the brāhmaṇ as the best husband for women of all other 'varṇas,'[3] though from the same context it transpires that the 'brāhmaṇī' often held opposite views, and had to be reclaimed from persons of other 'varṇas' with the help of the king's justice.[3] 'Vaiśī-putra's are known to the early Brāhmaṇas[4]; in the Yv. Ārya-Śūdrā connexions are subjects of jest amongst court and priestly circles,[5] so that legal marriage between such must have been frequent; and respectable Vedic personages, like Auśija, Kavaṣa or Vatsa, were sons of slave ('dāsī' or 'śūdrā') mothers.[6] The use of the term 'dāsī,' as compared with that of 'dāsa,' in Vedic texts, shows that the 'dāsī' very early came into contact with Āryan masters,[7] as a result probably of the extermination and subjugation of aboriginal tribesmen; accordingly, 'dāsī-putras' became quite common, and slave-girls presented to priests by conquerors could be called 'vadhū's or 'wedable' women.[8]

---

[1] Vide ante, sec. *re* sister-marriage.

[2] E.g. Śat. Brā. I, 8, 36.

[3] Cf. the many Purāṇic as well as Buddhistic cases.

[4] Vide V.I., I, 236.

[5] E.g. Gobh. Gṛh. Sūt. III, 4, 4-5; Apast. Dh. Sūt, II, 5, 11, 15, 16; etc.; (for 'sapiṇḍa' marriages: Gaut. Dh. Sūt. XIV, 13; Vāś. Dh. Sūt. IV, 17-19; cf. Manu: III, 5; Yāj. Dh. Śās I, 52, 53). In Vāts. Sūt. the maternal uncle's daughter is still frequently courted and married, amongst the Dākṣiṇātyas, *as well as elsewhere*, where the young man is more or less dependent on his maternal uncle or lives with him.

[6] Vāja. Saṃ. XXX, 5; Taitt. Brā. III, 4, 1, 1. In Purāṇic tradition Marutta, a famous Aikṣvāka prince, is called an 'āyogava'; this family is said to have been degraded to the Vaiśya status in ancient times owing to a mesalliance. (Query: Can it then be inferred that the Ikṣvākus were originally Śūdras?).

[7] Āśval, Śr. Sūt. IV, 2, 18.

[8] Vāja. Saṃ. XXIII, 30-31; Taitt. Saṃ. VII, 4, 19, 2-3.

---

[1] Vide ante; (the royal families concerned are the Śāryātas and the Pāñcālas). Cf. the many Purāṇic instances. Kākṣīvant's case is a mixed one on either side.

[2] Rv. I, 126. (Cf. early Purāṇic cases, e.g. that of Yayāti).

[3] Av. V, 17, 8.9. (Cf. the striking anecdote of Oghavatī in the Epic. and numerous instances of aberrations of brāhmaṇīs in the Purāṇas).

[4] Taitt. Brā. III, 9, 7, 3; Śat. Brā. XIII, 2.

[5] Vide note 8, page 101.

[6] Rv. I, 18, 1; I, 112, 11; Pañc. Brā. XIV, 11, 16; Bṛhadd. IV, 11 ff. (Ait. Brā. II, 19; Kauṣ. Brā. XII, 1, 3; cf. Weber: Ind. Stud. 3, 459; Lanman: Sans. Read. 386-'87; Pargiter: J.R.A.S., 1910, 50). Pañc. Brā. XIV, 6, 6; Kauṣ. Brā. XII, 3; Chānd. Upan. VI, 4, 4.

[7] Vide ante, sec. *re* slave-concubinage.

[8] Vide ante, ibid.

SOCIAL POSITION AND RELATIONS OF WOMEN.

It is significant that almost all the Vedic terms denoting woman express a special sense of actual or potential wifehood, and very few carry the simple meaning of woman as opposed to man. In Rv. the latter sense is found undoubted in ' stri '[1] (as opposed to ' pumāṃs ' or ' vṛṣan ' and as woman generally) ; but from Av. onwards ' strī ' comes to be opposed to ' pati ' and to mean wife,[2] though as late as the Sūtras ' strī ' is still distinct from ' jāyā,' and the general sense of ' woman ' always remained associated with it. ' Menā '[3] denotes, first, any female (of animals, etc.), then a woman (but the sense of ' potential motherhood ' may be implied). ' Kanā '[4] and other cognate terms (' kanyā,'[5] ' kanīnakā,'[6] ' kanyanā,'[7] ' kanyalā '[8]), in Rv. and Av., denote a ' maiden *and* young woman,' with no direct reference to wifehood, but are often used in contexts showing her fitness for wooing and marriage. ' Yuvati,'[9] while meaning ' youthful woman *and* a maiden,' implies a readiness for union with a ' marya '[10] (' young lover '). In some later Brāhmaṇas[11] ' yoṣā ' has sometimes the sense of a ' girl ' (in Av. as well),[12] or of ' female '[13] generally, as opposed to ' vṛṣan '; but, though occasionally the Rv. has it in the sense of a ' daughter,'[14] in the great majority of its occurrences ' yoṣā '[15] means ' young women, specially maidens, as meet for wedlock,'—while the Av. has also the sense of ' wife '[16]; the cognate terms ' yoṣan,'[17] ' yoṣaṇā[18] and ' yoṣit,'[19] also, have in Rv. the import of 'woman as young and ripe for marriage.' 'Nārī'[1] in Rv. has the clear import of woman as wife, as affected by matrimonial relations ('pati-juṣṭā,'[2] 'avidhavā,' 'supatnīḥ,'[3] etc.),—though in some cases the sense of 'woman as the sexual complement of man' is possible.[4] The term 'gnā' probably meant 'woman' originally, but was early restricted to 'divine women'; but there too, these are 'wives' of gods. It is doubtful if 'janī' ('jani') has the general sense of 'woman'[5] or a derivative sense of 'hetairai'[6] at all in the Rv. or later: it is almost always applied[7] in relation to 'pati,' and phrases are used joining the word with husband, marriage, or wifely position ('patyur janitvam,'[8] 'janayo na patnīḥ,'[9] etc.).

---

[1] Rv. I, 164, 16; V, 61, 8; etc. (also in : Mait. Saṃ. IV, 7, 4; Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 5, 8, 2).
[2] Av. XII, 2, 39; cf. Ait. Brā. III, 22, 1.
[3] Rv., I, 62, 7; 95, 6; II, 39, 2
[4] Rv., X, 61, 5; etc.
[5] Rv. I, 123, 10; 161, 5; III, 23, 10; etc. ; Av. I, 14, 2; XI, 5, 18: XII, 1, 25, etc.
[6] Rv. IV, 32, 23; X, 40, 9; (Nir. IV, 15).
[7] Rv. VIII, 35, 5.
[8] Av., V, 5, 3; XIV, 2, 52.
[9] Rv., I, 118, 5; II. 35, 4; III, 54, 14; IV, 18, 8; V, 2, 1, 2; IX, 86, 16; X, 30, 5; Av. XIV, 2, 61. (This sense continues in the Brā.°—Taitt. Brā. III, 1, 1, 9; 2, 4; Śat. Brā. XIII, 1, 9, 6; 4, 3, 8; etc.).
[10] Rv. III, 31, 7; 33, 10; IV. 20, 5; IX, 96, 20; etc.
[11] Śat. Brā. I, 8, 1, 7.
[12] Av. XII. 3. 29; XIV, 1, 56; etc. ; VI, 101, 1, etc. ; (cf. Delbrück : Ind. Ver., 418).
[13] Śat. Brā. I, 2. 5, 15; (freq. in Brā°s).
[14] Rv. I, 117, 20; (cf. Zimmer : Alt. Leb., 310).
[15] Rv. I, 48, 5; 92, 11; III, 33, 10; 38, 8; etc.
[16] Av. XII, 3, 29.
[17] Rv. IV, 5, 5.
[18] Rv. III, 52, 3; 56, 5; 62, 8; VII, 95, 3; etc.
[19] Rv. IX, 28, 4.

It would thus appear that from early Vedic times the woman has mainly and almost exclusively been conceived of as wife and mother, and marriage was her normal and inevitable condition. This aspect of the woman is emphasised in the terms applied to her as wife: she is 'janī' as bearing her husband's child,[10] and 'jāyā'[11] in the same sense along with that of the object of marital affection. Even as daughter she is 'duhitṛ,' 'the potential nourisher of a child.'[12] This characteristic conception of woman has determined largely her place in the social system of Ancient India. Her special sphere is therefore the home; and she has always been true to it, though from the Vedic age onwards, at different times, she has passed out of her groove and lived a much fuller life.[13]

Such being the standpoint from which the woman was regarded, it would seem to follow that a daughter was a welcome addition to the family. Though in Rv. the birth of

---

[1] Rv. VII, 20, 5; 55, 8; VIII, 77, 8; X, 18, 7; 86, 10-11; (also in Av. XIV, 2, 13; Vāja. Saṃ. XXIII, 36; Ait. Brā. III, 34).

[2] Rv. I, 73, 3.

[3] Rv. VII, 20, 5; X, 18, 7; etc.; (same sense later also, sometimes, e.g. Gaut. Dh. Sūt. IX, 28).

[4] Cf. Delbrück: Ind. Ver., 417.439.

[5] Rv. IV, 52, 1 (Ūṣas, a fair 'jani'=wife?); V, 61, 3 (here 'wives' is reqd., but cf. Delbrück: op. cit., 413).

[6] Rv. I, 85, 1; IV, 5, 5; 19, 5; VII, 18, 2; 26, 3; IX, 86, 32; (cf. X, 43, 1); (also in Vāja. Saṃ. XII, 35; XX, 40; 43; etc.); the plural use is no good ground for this sense.

[7] Rv. X, 110, 5 ('patibhyo na janayaḥ'); VIII, 2, 42 ('janitvana'); V, 61, 3 and X, 40, 10 (ref. to married condition).

[8] Rv. X, 18, 8.

[9] Rv. I, 62, 10; 186, 7.

[10] Cf. 'janī' contrasted with 'patni': Rv. I, 62, 10; 186, 7.

[11] Frequent in Rv. and Av. (for refs. vide V.I., I, 285-6); cf. the distinction in use of the terms 'jāyā' and 'patnī.'

[12] Cf. Delbrück: Ind. Ver., 454; V.I., I, 371.

[13] E.g. in Ṛgvedic, Upaniṣadic and Buddhistic periods.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

sons is specially desired,[1] nothing is said in it deprecating that of daughters; an ancient 'gathā' cited in the Ait. Brā.[2] apparently calls a son 'heavenly light' and a daughter 'misery,' but 'kṛpaṇaṃ' there might as well mean 'evoking tender feelings and compassion,' and a contrast is not required by the context; but in the Av.[3] female births are often regarded as unpopular,[4]—being apparently the view of the common people (with whose practices the Av. was largely connected): thus we hear of charms[5] for changing the foetus into a male one (the source of the later 'puṃsavana,') and of herbs which scared away demons seeking to convert it into a female. Female infanticide was, however, probably non-existent. Apparent references[6] to exposure of girl-infants may mean nothing more than 'laying aside the girl and taking up the boy,'[7] or 'getting rid of the girl by marriage'[8] (though even this would imply that girls were not cherished). The very fact that later Saṃhitās[9] (as well as Brā°s, Āraṇ°s and Upan.°s)[10] severely condemn 'bhrūṇa-hatyā' as the greatest crime would go against a supposition[11] that female infanticide was a Vedic practice, though this condemnation refers to the 'bhrūṇa' only, whose sex is yet unknown,[12] and may not have applied to the 'born' female infant; it is to be noted in this connexion that exposure of infants on other grounds was not unknown: the child of an illegitimate union is abandoned and exposed,[13] and there is an old Brāhmaṇa reference to two infants (probably boys) being exposed by a father[14]; so that if female infanticide existed it would certainly have found clear mention.

---

[1] Rv. I, 91, 20; 92, 13; III, 1, 23; X, 85, 25. 41. 42. 45; Av. III, 23, 2; V, 25, 11; VI, 11, 2; etc.

[2] Ait Brā. VII, 15.

[3] Av. VIII, 6, 25; and VI, 11, 3.

[4] On the other hand cf. Av. X, 8, 27: 'thou art woman *and* man, boy, *also* girl' (referring to human life as a mystic and divine entity).

[5] Av. VI, 11; and III, 23.

[6] Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXVII, 9; cf. Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 5, 10, 3; Mait. Saṃ. IV, 6, 4; 7, 9; Śāṅkh. Śr. Sūt. XV, 17, 12; (Nir. III, 4).

[7] Böhtlingk: Z.D.M.G., 44, 494-'96.

[8] Traditional rendering by comm.

[9] Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 5, 10, 2 and 3; Kāṭh. Saṃ. XXVII, 9; XXXI, 7; Kapiṣṭhala Saṃ., XLI, 7; Mait. Saṃ. IV, 1, 9; cf. Av. VI, 112, 3; 113, 2.

[10] Taitt. Brā., III, 2, 8, 11 and 12; Taitt. Āraṇ., II, 7, 3 and 8; Bṛhad. Upan., IV, 1, 22; Kauṣ. Upan., III, 1; (Nir., VI, 27).

[11] E.g. in Zimmer: Alt. Leb., 319-20; Delbrück: Ind. Ver., 575; Webed: Ind. Stud., 5, 54, 260, etc.

[12] Cf. Taitt. Saṃ., VI., 5, 10, 2-3 (guilt attaching to slaying an undiscriminated embryo).

[13] Rv. X, 99, 12; cf. Rv. IV, 19, 9; 30, 16.19; also I, 112, 8; II, 13, 12; 15, 7; X, 61, 8.

[14] Pañc. Brā. XI, 8, 8; Yuktāśva Āṅgirasa did it: hence sacred knowledge which departed from him had to be regained by rites.

When in spite of all prayers and spells it was after all a girl who descended on the family, it appears that she was not ill-treated in any way; for 'when a father and mother begat both son and daughter, the one engaged himself in the business of his father, while the other received honour '[1] (and 'the sonless father ensuring his daughter's progeny lived content...... honoured his son-in-law......and went to the son of his daughter '). The husband and wife, sacrificing together deem it 'a favour of the gods, if they reach their full extent of life with sons and daughters by their side.'[2] In a battle-song, while the bowstring whispers like a loving wife, the quiver is praised as the 'father of many daughters.'[3] (the point of the simile being, 'who as well as shafts overcome the hearts of men') ; so, to be a father of many daughters was not at all regarded as unlucky and its advantages were appreciated.

A happy love-match for their girl is the greatest concern of her parents, and they try all sorts of natural and supernatural means for that end.[4] When the married daughter left her father's home,[5] the benediction pronounced was full of tenderness (referring to the plucking of the fruit from its stalk and the untieing of Varuṇa's knot, the bond of parental affection). The parents of daughters were not very anxious to 'get rid of them by marriage '[6]; though from the Av. it appears that charms were uttered to secure husbands[7] for their daughters, yet it was only to strengthen her own endeavours; the match-making 'bride-wooer' was entertained, but his business was to win the ear of the maiden herself.[8] The mother would sometimes refuse to give her daughter to one not up to her ideal,[9] even when the father had no objection; and she resents[10] when her daughter suffers in the hands of a son-in-law addicted to gambling.

The mother no doubt wanted the daughter to help her in household work, and the unmarried sisters in the family together brought home water from the wells,[11] in jars poised on their heads ('seen by everybody but not known by the mind'),[12]

---

[1] Rv. III, 31, 1-2.

[2] Rv. VIII, 31, 5-9 ('kumāriṇā' and 'putriṇa' in v. 8).

[3] Rv. VI, 75, 1-7.

[4] E.g. adorning, sending to Samanas, instructing in arts, encouraging in love, entertaining 'bride-wooers,' performing magic rites.

[5] Av. XIV, 1, 17-20 and 46.

[6] Vide n. 8, p. 105.

[7] Av. II, 36.

[8] Av. VI, 60, 1.

[9] Cf. the 'Śyāvāśva episode' (Rv. V, 61, sp.; and Rv. V, 52-61; 81-82; VIII, 35-38; IX, 32; Bṛhadd. V, 49ff.).

[10] Rv. X, 34, 3.

[11] Rv. I, 191, 14 (seven 'agrūs'................ 'kumbhinī'......................).

[12] Av. X, 8, 14 (a beautiful simile, repeated often in later poetry).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

and wove and embroidered garments,[1]—for their own future husbands as well[2]; but at the same time they were not crushed with domestic duties, and could join the merriments of the village youths, with whom they swung in 'green and white' swings under the village banyan, with music of lute and cymbals and display of peacock plumes[3]; even as 'yuvatis' they had leisure and liberty enough to enjoy to the full the company of their lovers.[4]

The unmarried girl stays on with her father (mother or brother) for years together[5] without any resultant unpleasantness; she is ironically described as sitting long with 'the fathers,'[6] but that indicates the parental consideration she enjoyed[7]; she, on her part again, looked to her father's interests, as Apālā[8] cared for her father's fields (and his bald head). The very fact that home-staying old maids were not rare shows that daughters were not regarded by parents as undesirable burdens, though the daughters themselves would rather get married.[9] A 'tānva '[10] or 'legitimate son of the body' is said not to leave any share of the paternal property to his sister: this indicates that in the absence of such a 'tānva ' the daughter inherited or had preference over adopted or other sorts of sons. At any rate she was entitled to maintenance and marriage-dower[11] from even such a brother (who was also expected to find her a husband,[12] look after her social conduct,[13] and, along with his wife,[14] to guide her generally). In an age when adoption was hated,[15] when daughters could stay on unmarried in their father's house, till death without social penalty,[16] and when daughters' sons were thought as good as sons of the body,[17] the daughters' legal position and importance in the family was evidently better than it was later on. Many daughters apparently inherited property in some way or other: for 'many a maid was pleasing to the suitor who fain would marry for her splendid riches.'[1]

---

[1] Cf. Rv. II, 3, 6 and Vāja. Saṃ. XX, 41 (two sisters embroidering peśas on a stretched web); Av. X, 7, 42 (two sisters weaving a web stretched on 6 'mayūkhas,' one drawing the threads, the other setting them); cf. Taitt. Brā. II, 5, 5, 3 (same).

[2] Av. XIV, 2, 51 (the bridegroom wears this garment 'soft to touch' in the marriage ritual).

[3] Av. IV, 37, 4.

[4] Rv. III, 31, 7; 33, 10; IV, 20, 5; IX, 96, 20; etc.; cf. LI, 10, 5; (Nir. III, 15; IV, 2).

[5] Rv. I, 117, 7; II, 17, 7; X, 39, 3; 40, 5; Av. I, 14, 3; etc.

[6] Av. I, 14, 3.

[7] An old maid was probably allowed to manage her father's household: hence the point of the remark 'Yama's kulapā'; cf. next note.

[8] Rv. VIII, 80.

[9] E.g. Ghoṣā, Apālā; cf. Rv. I, 117, 7; (cf. also the Av. charms, showing the girls' initiative in this matter).

[10] Rv. III, 31, 2.

[11] Rv. I, 109, 2.

[12] Cf. n. 11, and Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 328.

[13] Cf. Rv. I, 124, 7; LV, 5, 5: Av. I, 17, 1 (cf. Av. I, 14, 2).

[14] Rv. X, 85, 46; Ait. Brā, III, 37, 5 (under wife).

[15] Rv. VII, 4, 7-8; (Nir. LII, 2).

[16] Vide n. 5 above.

[17] Rv. III, 31, 1

As she grows up, the daughter is allowed a larger share of personal and social freedom[2]; she is not rigidly secluded from the outside world, or hedged round with prohibitions. From sharing in the village dances and swings[3] she passes on to constant companionship with her chosen lovers.[4] She goes to festivals,[5] adorning herself in desire of marriage,[6] where she may even spend the night.[7] She receives suitors[8] quite as an independent person, goes to trysts to meet her love,[9] or meets him in her own home[10] while her people are asleep; she chooses her 'friend' as her husband in the midst of assembled men[11]; she may even elope with a knightly lover[12] against the wishes of her father. She candidly tries to get a husband herself,[13] before she becomes a confirmed old maid 'and it becomes too late.'[14] Brothers quite naturally exercised some amount of control over the social activities of the young maiden,[15] but only to the extent of seeing that no evil-minded man took any undue advantage of them.[16] As brothers were normally expected[17] to be on the look-out for a match for the sister, brotherless girls had often to be very forward, 'turning boldly towards men,'[18] attracting attention by red garments. And in spite of some amount of social feeling against breaking the order of seniority in matrimony,[19] younger sisters were not wanting who were 'anxious to woo'[20] before their elder sisters, and found husbands brave enough to face denunciations or opprobrious epithets.[1]—Vedic society thus appears to have taken it for granted that the woman had her likes and dislikes, her loves and joys, as much as the man. This personal freedom of action of the unmarried woman develops into a dignified wifehood after her marriage.[2]

---

[1] Rv. X. 27, 12 ('kiyatī yoṣā maryato vadhūyoḥ pariprītā panyasā vāryena').

[2] Cf. V.I., II, 485.

[3] Cf. n. 3, p. 107.

[4] Cf. n. 4, p. 107.

[5] Rv. IV, 58, 8; VI, 75, 4; VII, 2, 5; X, 86, 10; Av. II, 36, 1.

[6] Rv. VII, 2, 5; I, 123, 11; Av. II, 36, 1; cf. Rv. LV, 58, 9.

[7] For Samanas often lasted all night: Rv. I, 48, 6; VII, 9, 4.

[8] Rv. X, 27, 12; cf. n. 4, p. 107; and Rv. X, 30, 6.

[9] Rv. X, 34. 5; 40, 6.

[10] Rv. VII, 55, 5-8; cf. I, 134, 3; Av. LV, 5.

[11] Rv. X, 27, 12.

[12] Rv. I, 112, 19; 116, 1; 117. 20; X, 39, 7; 65, 12.

[13] Rv. VII, 2, 5; Av. II, 36, 1ff.; cf. the 'didhiṣū' and 'agre-didhiṣu.'

[14] Rv. I, 117, 7; X, 39, 6.

[15] Cf. notes 13 and 14 p. 107.

[16] Rv. IV, 5, 5.

[17] Cf. Zimmer: Alt. Leb. 328.

[18] Rv. I, 124, 4.7; etc.

[19] Censured as sinful in later Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas, followed by Dharma-Sūtras (see n. 20 below and n. 1, p. 109).

[20] Vāś. Dh. Sūt. XX, 7 ff. (cf. Vāja. Saṃ. XXX, 9). Probably also referred to in Taitt. Saṃ. III. 2. 4. 4; Kāt. Śr. Sūt. II, 1, 22; Kauś. Sūt. 3, 5; 137, 37. Vide note 1, next page.

Both as wife and as daughter, women were admitted to the privileges of the highest education, at least amongst the intellectual sections of the people.[3] The early Vedic literature, as is well-known, contains contributions from women[4]; and women played an important part in the later Vedic period, in the Upaniṣadic discussions,[5] a fact which explains the subsequent activities of women in the age of the Buddhistic Reformation.[6] In the society of the Yv. Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas[7] women love music and marry by preference men who can sing, so that they must have ordinarily been taught dancing and music; thus 'gāthās' were sung at weddings, and in Yv. ritual also the 'patnī-sāmans, or wives' songs have a recognized position. In an Upaniṣadic household it was thought worth while to go through special ceremonials in order to secure the birth of a daughter who would distinguish herself[8] by learning. Learned women are often referred to in the Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣads and Sūtras.[9] The Atharvaveda, in the verses in praise of Vedic studentship, declares that it is by virtue of her 'brahmacarya' that a young maiden gets a husband[10]: this may point to some otherwise undetailed traditional course of instruction to girls,[11] similar to the well-known system of schooling going by that name; or it may well have been the case, that girl students sometimes resided with the family of a teacher for a number of years, equally with boy-students, a system implied in the Epic-Purāṇic and in classical Sanskrit literature[1] as well. The extensive use of metronymics in post-Vedic literature (appearing from even the Ṛgvedic times onwards),[2] is partly accounted for by the fact that women of the more intellectual groups amongst the brāhmaṇs or kṣatriyas had often as much reputation in the learned circles of teachers as their men,[3] and a metronymic must often have been something to be proud of, serving as a good introduction to its bearer (like 'Gārgīputra').[4] Post-Vedic literature indeed knows of quite a number of women-teachers of philosophy and ritual, married or otherwise,[5] who apparently flourished towards the end of the Ṛgvedic period and immediately after it.[6] The unmarried ('kumārī') women-teachers were designated 'gandharva-gṛhītā,' or 'married to the Gandharva(s).'[7]

---

[1] E.g. 'agre-dadhus' (Yv. Saṃ°s); 'agre-didhiṣu' (Yv. Saṃ°s, Taitt. Brā. and Dh. Sūt°s); 'agre-didhiṣū-pati' (Yv. and Dh. Sūt.); cf. 'didhiṣū-pati' (Dh. Sūt.) ref. to elder sister; and 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna' (in Av., Yv. Saṃ°s, and Brā.°, ref. to breaking of order of seniority amongst brothers).

[2] When she is free, for instance, to address councils; vide *ante*, pp. 8, 10 and 11.

[3] Cf. Hopkins. J. Am. Or. S., 13, 351-'52; Weber : Ind. Stud. 10, 118-19.

[4] E.g. Rv. V, 28; VIII, 80; X, 39; 40; etc.

[5] E.g. Bṛhad. Upan. III, 6, 1; 8, 1; Āśval. Gṛ. Sūt. III, 3, 4; etc.

[6] As evidenced in convents, missions, philanthropic and educational work.

[7] Taitt. Saṃ. VI, 1, 6, 5; Mait. Saṃ. III, 7, 3; etc.; Śat. Brā. III, 2, 4, 3-6 (where however music seems to be regarded as rather a vain pursuit for man, suiting women better).

[8] Bṛhad. Upan. VI, 4, 17 (a 'paṇḍitā duhitā').

[9] Ait. Brā. V, 29; Kauṣ. Brā. II, 9; Bṛhad. Upan. III, 3, 1; 7, 1; Āśval. Gṛ. Sūt. III, 4, 4; Śāṅkh. Gṛ. Sūt. IV, 10.

[10] Av. XI, 5, 18; ('brahma-vādinī' women, amongst both royal and priestly families, occur in Purāṇic traditional accounts from the very earliest steps; a few of them are mentioned in Vedic literature also, e.g. Mamatā-Āṅgirasī).

[11] Courses of sacred instruction for both boys and girls are found amongst many primitive or ancient tribes.

---

[1] E.g., the case of Ambā residing as a student with the Śaikhāvatyas, in the Epic; or the heroine of Kālidāsa's famous drama, along with her friends, in the charge of the venerable matron of the hermitage. (The ref. here may however be to purely Epic conditions.)

[2] Vide ante.

[3] E.g. Patañcala-Kāpya's wife and daughter, Yājñavalkya's wives, etc.; Yājñavalkya proves his superiority by showing that he knows all that the former two ladies knew; some of these women are included in lists of ṛṣis and teachers regularly honoured by Vedic students. Vide n. 5 below.

[4] Bṛhad. Upan. VI, 4, 30. (Of the Vedic and post-Vedic metronymics some at least may thus refer to descent from women-teachers).

[5] Ait. Brā. V, 29; Kauṣ. Brā. II, 9;—authoritative opinion of a 'kumārī gandharva-gṛhītā,' on Agnihotra ritual. Patañcala-Kāpya's daughter was a 'gandharva-gṛhītā': Bṛhad. Upan. III, 3, 1; so was his wife: ibid III, 7, 1; they instruct enquirers from distant lands; Patañcala himself learns from his wife. Gārgī Vācaknavī, Vaḍavā-Prātitheyī and Sulabha-Maitreyī are classed with ṛṣis in the Sūtras: cf. Śāṅkh. Gṛh. Sūt. IV, 10; Āśval. Gṛh. Sūt. III, 4, 4.

[6] The first two references in n. 5 above relate to the time of Jātukarṇya; the others refer to the times of Uddālaka-Āruṇi and 'Yājñavalkya,' between two or four to seven generations after the Ṛgvedic compilation. It may be noted that Patañcala was an inhabitant of Madra, while the other names may be located in Mithilā.

[7] Cf. V.I., I. 486: with the exception of Patañcala-Kāpya's 'bhāryā' who is also so called: apparently she was originally a 'gandharva-gṛhītā kumārī,' and had established her reputation as such before she married Patancala, so that she continued to be known by her old designation (or 'bhāryā' here may be taken in the older sense of 'female member of the household,' i.e., the same as Patañcala's daughter' mentioned in the same connexion). It seems (from the context) that such women-teachers were supposed to be possessed by the spirits of ancient Āṅgirasa (or Atharvanic) seers,—a remarkable point.

This epithet is significant, and throws some light on the later[1] practice of formal or nominal marriage of courtesans or 'artistes'[2] to some deity or woodland spirit[3]; it also explains the paradoxical statement in the Vedic marriage hymns, that three divinities are the first three husbands of a maiden, the fourth being the 'husband proper.'[4] Evidently the Vedic society conceived of girl-life as developing through three stages (physical, moral and intellectual) into the fourth,[5] that of actual wifehood, where girlhood ended: the stage presided over by Soma represents gradual acquisition of beauty and grace,[6] that by Agni, of knowledge of domestic religious custom[7] and purity of character, and that by the Gandharva,[8] of various accomplishments. It follows that in theory every girl was supposed to have passed through a period of training and acquired some accomplishments,—they may have been anything from dancing[9] to the subtlest ritualistic or esoteric doctrines[10]—before she could enter married life.[1] At the same time such entry did not put a stop to the activities of her-preceding life-stages, as many of the women teachers and debaters were wives,[2] and could follow their husbands through all the stages of their intellectual and spiritual development.[3] It is also significant that in the Vedic society every woman seems to have been conceived of as ever in a state of marriage,[4]—as a child, with Soma or some other deity of abstractions,—as a young maiden, with the Arts personified,—and then finally with her human husband, for whom indeed her mother impatiently watches the development[5] of her youth, carefully guides her toilet,[6] and for whom she herself weaves the soft nuptial robes in sweet anticipation.[7]

---

[1] But probably a very ancient practice; marriage to a tree is known in the Jātakas. In the Av. women are believed to be possessed and enjoyed by Gandharvas, apparently in the course of village dances, music and swingings; probably the confirmed flirts and musical experts, who formed the central figures of village festivities, and refused to marry, were the first 'gandharva-gṛhītās.' They probably represent the 'apsarases' of Vedic and Epic-Purāṇic tradition and the 'gaṇikā's' of Buddhist and post-Mauryan periods; cf. their eminent position in the learned, literary and court circles as described in the Vāts. Kā. Sūt.

[2] Sometimes women of considerable wit and attainments, attached to the stage or the temple. Vide n. 1 above.

[3] The temple god, a Kumāra image, or some tree, etc.

[4] Rv. X, 85, 40.41 Av. XIV, 2, 3.4; cf. Av. V, 17, 2.

[5] The analogy of the 'āśrama' theory is significant; probably it indicates an occasionally followed scheme of female education.

[6] Cf. the traditional comparison of a girl's development with the moon's waxing (e.g., in Kumāra: I; cf. also the term 'ṣoḍaśī,' which alludes to the 16 lunar phases). Soma might also signify, more particularly, the development of adolescence (owing to the Moon's supposed connexion with menstruation).

The ref. in Av. II, 36, however, to 'King Soma making the maiden of good fortune' and to 'Soma and Brahman enjoying (tasting), and Aryaman enriching (renewing) her fortune (or youth, person),—suggests another distinct yet similar conception (in perhaps another age or society), according to which the King (typified by the legendary ancestor of all Aila ruling families), and the Brahman or High Priest of the tribe (or the priesthood as a body), were regarded as in theory (or perhaps optionally in practice) the legal 'masters' of every maiden of the tribe, till her marriage, which was supposed to be due to the good offices of Aryaman and favour of Agni: all this acc. to the divine law of Dhātar. The explanation of the comm. that Brahman = Gandharva (!) and so the ref. is to XIV. 2, 3.4, is by no means convincing.

[7] Cf. the vital importance of the wife for the fire-ritual in a household. Agni's lordship might also imply a period of 'brahmacarya' for the sake of suitable marriage.

The presiding genius of the Fine Arts, like the Muses; just as the Apsarases patronized games and sport (Av. X, 10, 3).

[9] Cf. note 7, page 109.

[10] Cf. note 9, p. 109; and note 4, p. 110.

---

[1] For in theory the husband is the 'fourth' possessor of a woman.

[2] E.g. Gārgī; Patañcala-Kāpya's wife; etc.

[3] E.g. Yājñavalkya's wife; (the Vedic wife, like Mudgalānī-Indrasenā, could also share the husband's martial glory).

[4] Cf. immediate remarriage or devṛ-marriage after widowhood. Cf. also the later and modified doctrine of Manu, regarding the perpetual dependence of woman on man.

[5] Av. VIII, 6, 1.

[6] Rv. I, 123, 11, etc.

[7] Av. XIV. 2, 51.

EVIDENCE OF TRADITION.

Re Primitive Forms and Special Customs.

INTRODUCTORY.

There is a good deal of agreement between the evidence of the Vedic literature and that of the Purāṇic and Epic sources, with regard to the types of marriage, traces of its primitive forms, and the general position of women in society. This is only what might be expected. In the scale of historical values the Vedas and the rest of the priestly literature are still taken to be the standard, and whatever is not mentioned therein is taken to be *non est* or late and fabricated, while the least suspicion of a mention is developed into an ingenious theory, often by the same process whereby the sesasum of proverb changes into a palm-fruit. It is ignored that whatever authority the priestly literature may have in questions of religious, mythological and theological developments (and even there it is by no means an exclusive authority),[1] it cannot, in the nature of things be taken as the prime and best source of historical facts. As is well known, priesthoods have, quite naturally, a strong tendency towards conceited isolation resulting in ignorance or ignoring of secular thought and events and towards perversion of whatever knowledge of affairs they might acquire, to serve the interests of their own order and pretensions; the first characteristic is displayed throughout the Vedic literature in both forms; the second becomes notorious in the Purāṇic and Epic literature,—the custody of which, according to well-attested traditions passed to the priesthood[2] from the professional chroniclers and bardic experts, some little time after the catastrophe of the Bhārata or all-India war, which apparently introduced a period of decline in the 'Vedic' ruling classes and court life, that had hitherto sustained this latter stream[3] of historico-literary productions. But even the mis-use of this sacred custody has not been able to obliterate the traditions of that early pre-Bhārata age, some of which were too deeply rooted in the popular memory and knowledge to be removed or wholly modified, even though offending against the priestly theories or subsequently changed ideas; and through the blurring daubs and confusions of subsequent brāhmaṇical accretions and perversions, can still be discerned,—thanks to the naïve, uncritical, and unhistorical treatment of their otherwise intellectual authors,—something of the original basic fabric. This supplies what is wanting in the Ṛgveda and other Saṁhitās and Brāhmaṇas, namely, prima facie and bona fide historical events and conditions for most of the period covered by the former group. The value of this source becomes greater, when 'incidental' evidence in the 'priestly' group of texts finds explanation, illustration, or support in the 'bardic' one.

---

[1] Cf. Sörensen: preamable to the Index, for the growing conviction that Vedic religion and mythology cannot be properly understood without reference to Epic and Purāṇic.

[2] Cf. Chānd. Upan. III, 4, where the King's daughter refers to herself as the daughter of the lauded person, and the purohita's daughter as the daughter of the laudator, and so inferior. By this time therefore the Purāṇic chronicles had passed under priestly control from Sūtas, and the time agrees perfectly with what the Purāṇas themselves disclose.

[3] Distinct and independent, and associated with special classes and lands.

The establishment of the position taken up here would involve a detailed examination of the historical elements in the entire Vedic, Purāṇic and Epic literature,—a matter outside the scope of the present dissertation. It will be sufficient to note here, that after a careful sifting of evidently later and brāhmaṇical modifications, and rejection of all of those well-known extravagances of fancy, there still remains a residuum of fact, which cannot be given any other name besides 'traditional history,'—which has every mark of having at one time been carefully handed down through professional recorders,—and which can be given a tentative, workable, framework of chronology to stand upon, by a consideration and collation of undoubted synchronisms and uniform assertions. These synchronisms, plain statements, and the resultant scheme of chronology, elucidate much ill-understood matter in the Vedic literature, correct wrong perspectives and give them their proper setting and importance. At the same time there is nothing in this clarified tradition that is really inconsistent with definitely 'Vedic' facts. It is indeed strange that such an obvious source of historical information has so long lain outside the critical ken of scholars,—and that so much of fanciful speculations, unnecessary theories, preconceived notions, almost prejudices, should have gathered round the study of that other group of texts,—historically the most unpromising. But a wider comparative study and estimate is bound to come, and a reaction is overdue. Often scholars shrink from it, as from an impossible task or perilous venture, simply because they have been accustomed only to the usual 'Vedic' studies conducted in a peculiarly bookish manner, and have imbibed the 'brāhmaṇic tradition' (if any) unconsciously or in spite of themselves. One has, however, only to swerve the searchlight of critical study from 'Vedic' to 'bardic' lore, for a time, and then to and fro, to strike the right course. As it is, we have too long been making for various misty uncertain shores,—for the solar or nebular

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

myths, or the vegetation dramas[1]; or been engaged, in exposing imaginary fabricators of tales from sacred texts,[2] in following the Indo-Afghan Vedic conquerors, as they issued through the Khyber Pass, severed from their Persian kin,[3]—or in depicting the typical Vedic King,[4] strengthened in Indra's favour by the medicine-man, killing 99 noseless Dāsas a day, ploughing his Punjāb submontane field, tending his sheep and cattle, squatting on grass-mats, and sleeping in his hedge-girt hut or cow-pen, safe from forest spirits.

The very fact that the 'traditional' material makes clearer and fuller what might be obscurely suggested by the Vedic,[5]—and sometimes vice versa,[6]—and that a rational continuous history, dynastic as well as cultural, discloses itself on putting the two together,—which sufficiently explains[7] all that is yet known about early Indian conditions,—is a strong proof of the validity of the position set forth above.

The results obtained from this view will now be detailed, so far as the selected topics are concerned.

[1] It will be enough to mention Ludwig's identification of Kṛṣṇa and five Pāṇḍavas with the Earth and five seasons, and Keith's notion that the story of Kṛṣṇa and Kaṃsa is a vegetation myth, which was often dramatised ritually.

[2] For this view cf. the recent Vedic Index.

[3] Even the recently discovered Boghāz-küi inscriptions have been sought to be explained away owing to this preconceived notion.

[4] It is a common mistake to take the Vedic period as a very short one and at the same time the most primitive one in Ancient India.

[5] For instance, the full explanation that the Epic-Purāṇic traditions give, of the vague mentions of Kuru, Pāñcāla, and their kings, in the Rv., and Brā.°s.

[6] As in the case of Dīrghatamas and Kākṣīvant.

[7] E.g., a rational explanation of Āryan expansion, of the Inner and Outer Āryan groups, or of development of Brāhmaṇism in the Sarasvatī and Kuru-Pāñcāla country is afforded by traditional history.

I.

BROTHER AND SISTER MARRIAGES.

As we have seen, sister-marriage was not very rare in the Ṛgvedic period (the references indicating its actual occurrence, and theoretic discouragement in the latter part of it). The dynastic accounts in the common Purāṇic tradition, referring to the ruling nobility as well as the priesthood in that connection, contain many plain indications of the frequent occurrence of such consanguinous marriages, intermittently throughout the whole period covered by that tradition, viz., 90 steps, roundly,[1] backwards from the Bhārata War and the compilation of the Vedic texts. When these instances (along with those of other types and forms of sex-relations) are referred to and located in the general scheme of dynastic sequences, that evolves readily out of the patent synchronisms and consistent assertions, they[2] become very significant from the standpoint of early social history.

The first instance of a sister-marriage in the dynastic lists is that of Aṅga and his 'father's daughter' Sunīthā, the parents[3] of the famous Veṇa.[4] As with other similar cases, the designation 'pitṛ-kanyā,'[5] though preserved without comments in one Purāṇa,[1] has given rise to emended readings and fanciful fables[2]: thus 'Mṛtyu-kanyā,'[3] is another reading for 'pitṛ-kanyā,'[4]—which is closely connected with that figment about the mind-born daughters of the Pitṛs.'[5] A Purāṇic account also professes to give details of the wooing of 'Mṛtyu-kanyā' Sunīthā,[6] where it is she who takes the initiative in it; it is interesting to compare Yamī's similar attitude[7] in the Vedic poem; some of the later cases[8] also imply similar initiative on the part of the 'pitṛ-kanyā,' viz. with Acchodā (*m.* Amāvasu) and Narmadā (*m.* Purukutsa).[9]

---

[1] The Purāṇic tradition indeed goes back to still earlier times, and the Ailas and Aikṣvākas are treated as continuations of an earlier ruling race or races,—portions of whose story are as much historical in form as the later dynastic accounts; some traces of the pre-Aila marriage-relations will be shown infra.

[2] The following instances are given in order of chronological sequence only, and not according to clarity of illustration.

[3] In all accounts of Pṛthu-Vainya's ancestry in the Purāṇas and the Epic.

[4] Celebrated in Purāṇic texts (as well as in early Vedic texts); cf. "chosen King, an ideal one, supplanting 'prajāpatis,'—before Nahuṣa, in the beginning of the (present) Vaivasvata epoch": Padma: II, 35.

[5] This apparently curious expression becomes fully intelligible when it is considered that in the genealogical ślokas it is the practice to describe a wife as so-and-so's daughter, so that the only way in which a sister-marriage could be described was to call the wife 'pitṛ-kanyā.' It is possible that this expression was chosen as including half-sisters also, who would be only the father's daughters. In this connection it is noteworthy that in early Vedic texts (and the original Sūta-Māgadha texts must have been equally ancient) 'bhaginī' does not occur, and 'svasṛ' is a wide, general and relative term, while to designate sister as a blood-relation the qualification 'jāmi' is used (vide ante). It is probable that 'pitāmaha-sutā' (or daughter of Prajāpati or Brahmā) in many genealogies really stands for a first cousin, just as 'pitṛ-kanyā'=sister.

Eight generations after Aṅga and Sunīthā's time (according to the Purāṇic computation) we come across with several alleged sister-marriages, amongst the fresh groups of kindred races[10] that succeeded the Pṛthu-ites.[11] The clearest notice is that of Danu's son Vipracitti (by Kaśyapa) marrying Diti's daughter Siṃhikā (also by Kaśyapa), Danu and Diti being sisters and co-wives[1]; it is to be noted that their descendants (though recognized as a mixed "Daitya-Dānava" clan) were called Saiṃhikeyas, after the sister-wife.[2] The Yama and Yamī of Ṛgvedic tradition are assigned by Purāṇas to the next generation, being children of Vivasvant,[3] one of Vipracitti and Siṃhikā's step-brothers. Manu, another son of Vivasvant, also seems to have had a sister-wife: for Śraddhā is stated to have been a daughter of Vivasvant,[4] and the genealogies make Śrāddha Manu's wife; Manu, again, is called 'Śrāddha-deva'[5]; this ancient incest ascribed to a great name may have given rise to the Purāṇic question: "Why was Manu called Śrāddhadeva"—which has introduced so many Brāhmaṇical fables and didactic matter in the Purāṇas.[6] But a more historical reference is to be found in the story of Cyavana-Bhārgava,[7] (contemporary with Saryāti-Mānava, a step lower), who was the son of a Pulomā, whom her previously 'betrothed husband,' a Puloman, forcibly abducted from her 'de jure' husband Bhṛgu's house: when the sacrificial Agni is said to

---

[1] Matsya: 4, 43-44 (Svāyambhava Manu's dynasty, step No. 9).

[2] In most Purāṇas, evidently by way of after-thought or through misunderstanding.

[3] Matsya: 10, 3.

[4] Or 'pituḥ,' or possibly 'Uroḥ' or 'Muroḥ' (the 'm' belonging to the preceding line) kanyā, Uru being Aṅga's father.

[5] As Mṛtyu=Yama=lord of the Pitṛs. Cf. the brāhmaṇical 'pitṛ-vaṃśa' sections of Purāṇas; and Pargiter: AIHT. pp. 69-70; 86; 196, 213.

[6] Padma: II, 29-35: urged by her father, and helped in her plans by her companions, she arranged a meeting with Aṅga (who wanted a strong successor), married him, and by him had the son Veṇa.

[7] Her plea of the necessity of begetting a worthy grandson for their father and her arranging to meet the brother suitably.

[8] Vide infra.

[9] Probably this points to a type of sister-marriage similar to what prevailed amongst the ancient Egyptian ruling classes, where in the customary consanguinous royal marriages the sister was the central figure. (Cf. the dynastic history of Ancient Egypt, and the position of Cleopatra even in a much later period.)

[10] I.e., 'the descendants of Dakṣa's daughters.' The Purāṇic accounts of these pre-Aila races are well worth studying from the ethnological and geographical points of view; they are consistent in many respects, and seem to embody real racial memories.

[11] Some real personages of these groups have, however, become semi-mythical (e.g., the Danu-ite Vipracitti or the Vaivasvata Yama), apparently because subsequent developments of Aila and Aikṣvāka dynastic histories had little continued connections with these branches (after Duṣyanta in the Aila section, and earlier in the Aikṣvāka section), and these, by dropping out of the chronicles, tended to become legendary.* But this does not make any difference here; it is sufficient that such marriage-relations are indicated by tradition at this particular stage of traditional history.

* Still even in very much later times, the Danu-ite and Diti-ite princes of traditional accounts are real persons, distinguished from the mythical as 'manuṣya-dharmāḥ' or '°dhanyāḥ' (Vāyu: 68, 15-16; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 6, 1-3; etc.), probably they had some traces of non-Aila or non-Aikṣvāka descent, though not always so.

---

[1] Vāyu: 67, 60; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 5, 12: Hariv.: 3, 184-'5; 204-'5; 213-'14; Matsya: 6, 25. Amongst Diti's near descendants, again, the Hālāhala 'gaṇa' (2 steps after Siṃhikā) are said to have sprung from Anuhlāda's son Vāyu and daughter Sinībālī: apparently another instance in the same group (Vāyu: 67, 75; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 5, 33 ff.).

[2] Vāyu: 68, 17-22; Matsya; 6, 25; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 6, 17-22. So also, other branch races of this age are designated by metronymics, except the Vaivasvatas or Mānvas, which may have an ethnic significance. But the point to be noted here is that the 'mother-side' is stronger even in case of a brother-sister marriage.

[3] Son of Aditi, and alleged progenitor of the Aikṣvāka (and Aila) dynasties. This bordering on myth need not be ruled out, for real men and women with names of favourite gods and goddesses have been very common in India; so in detailed genealogies like this, apparently reasonable traditions must be given their due. The reference (in the 'Āditya' genealogies) to another contemporary parallel of Vipracitti and Siṃhikā's case, in 'Indra' son of Aditi and his wife Śacī-Paulomī, may be legendary; nevertheless the traditional ascription of consanguinous connections to several members of a group has some value. It is curious that Pūṣan, who is a brother of Indra in these Purāṇic tables, should also be described in the Ṛv. as wooing his sister (vide ante).

[4] Mbh. XII, 265, 9449.

[5] Mbh. XII, 4507; but in XII, 13219, Śrāddha-deva = Vivasvant (probably wrong for Vaivasvata?).

[6] Cf. Hariv. 16-18. It is to be noted that the Purāṇic tradition assigns the origin of the cult and ritual of 'Śrāddha' from comparatively later periods, either from the time of Nimi son of Dattātreya, or from that of Jamadagni, both ascriptions relating practically to the same age, much later than Manu's. So the brāhmaṇical connection between Manu and 'Śrāddha' is wrong and probably dates from after the standardization of Manu's code, by which time an explanation of Manu's incest had become necessary; 'Śrāddha-deva' is therefore derived from his wife and sister Śraddhā, just as Rāma has a variant appellation Sītāpati: (probably 'Śraddhā-deva' would be a better reading).

[7] Mbh. § 20 (Pulomā): I, 5-7.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

have admitted his rights over her (she being his by choice, and Bhṛgu's by formal rites). This seems to refer to a custom among the Pulomites (cognate to the Diti-ites)[1] of consanguinous marriage, probably a brother-sister one.

Two steps further down we come upon firmer ground, and henceforwards the references are without doubt historical in character, the details being dynastic and incidental.[2] The famous Nahuṣa-Aila is stated to have married a 'pitṛ-kanyā,' Virajā,[3] who became the mother of Yayāti, etc. In the same connection Amāvasu-Aila is also stated to have been chosen by 'pitṛ-kanyā' Acchodā[4] as her husband, apparently in the face of some opposition.[5] So Nahuṣa had before him the precedent of his paternal uncle (the founder of the Kānyakubja line). In the same generation as Nahuṣa's, and in the same part of the country,[6] there was another clear case,—amongst the Bhṛgus (martial priests, who presently attached themselves to Yayāti and his descendants, specially the Yādavas): Śukra-Uśanas, Yayāti's father-in-law, married 'pitṛ-kanyā' Go (or Gā).[7] This throws some light on the Kaca-Devayānī story, where Kaca refuses to accept her as wife, as she being his teacher's daughter was 'equal to his sister,' but Devayānī insists (cf. Yamī's insistence) and finally curses him for refusing her.[8] Devayānī naturally regarded the excuse as a lame one, her father having married a sister (who was his

---

[1] Cf. n. 1 and 3, p. 118.

[2] Concerned mainly with the Aila and Aikṣvāka kings, and closely connected priestly families like Bhṛgus and Vāsiṣṭhas.

[3] Vāyu : II, 93, 12; Brahma : 12, 1; Hariv. : 30, 1599; Matsya : 15, 23; Liṅga : I, 66, 60-'1; Kūrma : I, 22, 5.

[4] Matsya : 14, 1 ff.; Brahmāṇḍa : III, 10, 54 ff.

[5] Fable adds that the 'pitṛs' cursed her for this choice to be born again of Amāvasu or Vasu (Caidya) as Satyavati (Kālī, etc.); and the 'tithi' of the evil choice became 'Amāvasyā.' Such fables were obviously due to misinterpretation of 'pitṛ-kanyā,' and in this case the starting points of the fable may have been the common royal name Amāvasu (or Vasu), the Purāṇic saying that the Vasus were Pitṛs (e.g., Matsya : 19, 3), and the connection between 'Amāvasyā' and 'Kālī.' It seems the fable about 'Amāvasyā' arose out of Acchodā's appellation 'Amāvāsavī,' which again came to be confused with Vāsavi (Satyavatī); probably Satyavatī's being 'punarbhū' has also led to the story of the second birth of Acchodā; cf. similar confusion re Ajamīḍha's punarbhū wife, from which has originated the fable of Ajamīḍha's 2 births; cf. Vāyu : 99, 206-9; Matsya : 50, 17-19; where 'punarbhave' and 'putrābhāve' are apparently corrupt readings for 'punarbhavā' (°bhuvi, etc.); cf. Ugrāyudha's would-be 'punarbhū' wife Satyavatī, in the same Pāñcāla line.

[6] As the Yayāti story shows, besides other geographical references (re Vṛṣaparvan, Nahuṣa, etc.).

[7] Matsya : 15, 15; Brahmāṇḍa : III, 1, 74-77. (Śukra is here said to have been daughter's son of Hiraṇya-kaśipu, whose sister Siṃhikā married a half-brother). 'Go' was not a rare name; cf. Kakutstha's daughter Go, whom Yati married in the next generation; and Śuka's sister-wife Pīvarī, also called Go.

[8] Mbh. § 145 (Sambhavap.° : Kaca) : I, 76-77.

'dayitā' wife)[1]; her elder sister Devī married one 'Varuṇa'[2] and Kavi's immediate descendants ("sons") were called Varuṇas[3]; so Devī may have married a brother or a first cousin, —as Śukra-Uśanas was 'Kāvya,' or Kavi himself, according to one version.[4] Kaca himself, being an Āṅgirasa, had little moral ground to refuse; for among the Āṅgirasas, Śaṃyu's second son Bharata married his three sisters,[5] and there were other incestuous marriages in the Āṅgirasa group.[6] As for marrying a preceptor's daughter, it is not very likely that custom was much stricter in Kaca's days, when so late as one or two generations after the Bhārata war[7] a favourite resident pupil could be made the preceptor's son-in-law,[8] and even be asked (or allowed) to beget children on his wife.[9] Kaca's attitude therefore has no bearing on 'sister-marriage' in that age, but is an obvious case of political prudence,[10] just as the subsequent marriage of Devayānī had an admittedly political significance.[11]

For about ten steps after this we lose sight of sister-marriages; then we get two very probable instances in the Aila as well as in the Aikṣvāka line, in the latter apparently for the first time since the semi-legendary Vaivasvatas, Yama and Manu. In each case the texts are muddled in the extreme, and obviously the different readings are futile attempts to rectify something that was ill-understood or was considered improper and damaging; the motive was quite a natural one, as in both cases the reference is to the marriage-relations of the immediate progenitors or successors[1] of famous Aila and Aikṣvāka kings. The Aila instance is further entangled in confusion, as there seems to have been an irregular succession after Matināra,[2] and a gap[3] in the dynasty soon after this point,[4] as a result of the Haihaya (Yādava) expansion and raids[5] (the great historical event of these times).

---

[1] Matsya: 15, 15. Devayānī was Śukra's daughter by another wife, a daughter of an 'Indra,' who may be Raji who had become 'Indra' in his day; cf. Āpnavān, another Bhṛgu of this time, marrying Ruci, daughter of Nahuṣa, who also had become an 'Indra' like his younger brother; or Devayānī's mother may have been a daughter of Nahuṣa-'Indra' himself; in any case her marriage with Yayāti would be a consanguinous one.

[2] Mbh. § 124 (Aṃśāvat°.) : I, 66, 2616.

[3] Mbh. § 747, b. (Suvarṇotp°.) : XIII, 85, 4149.

[4] In Mbh. Śukra = Kavi; or Kaviputra sometimes; cf. Sörensen: Index: p. 403.

[5] Mbh. § 490 (Āṅgirasa) : III, 219, 14135-37; though the account as a whole is mixed up with mythology, that does not diminish the value of the detail quoted. (An Āṅgirasa Śaṃyu was somewhat earlier than the historical Bharadvāja-Āṅgirasa whose chronological position is fixed by synchronisms.)

[6] E.g., a daughter becoming a married wife: Mbh. § 490 (Āṅgirasa); III, 219.

[7] I.e., in Uddālaka-Āruṇi's time.

[8] Kahoḍa married Uddālaka's daughter Sujātā.

[9] Śvetaketu was so begotten on Uddālaka's wife; cf. also the Vedic custom of transferring a widow to her deceased husband's pupil.

[10] The Aṅgirās and 'Devas' were at war with the Bhṛgus and 'Asuras' or Vṛṣaparvites, and Kaca-Āṅgirasa's mission was to cheat the latter.

[11] As the Mbh. states, in reply to the question 'how Devayānī came to be Yayāti's wife,' that both Uśanas and Vṛṣaparvan courted Yayāti and sought his alliance.

Of the texts that give an account of the Paurava King Matināra's descendants down to Duṣmanta-Ailina (the reviver of the line), those of the Brahma and Harivaṃśa appear in this case to be the best[6]; Vāyu is here most corrupt,[7] and cannot be checked by the corresponding Brahmāṇḍa text which is lost; the Matsya and the Mahābhārata[8] have loosely followed and confused the two source-texts of Vāyu and Brahma-Harivaṃśa, while the Viṣṇu and the Agni[9] give very brief and unsatisfactory summaries of these respectively. By collating these two latter texts first, and then that of Vāyu with it, a proto-text may be approximately drawn up, specially as the source of the Vāyu in this passage seems to have been the same in spite of various corrupt readings. According to this collated text,[10] " From Matināra, by

---

[1] Viz., Matināra and Duṣyanta (Bharata's father),—Ailas; Prasenajit, Yuvanāśva, Māndhātṛ, Purukutsa,—Aikṣvākas.

[2] Vide infra.

[3] This must be admitted partly on the strength of synchronisms, and partly because the undoubted Haihaya raids and supremacy implies prostration of the kingdoms of Madhyadeśa for the time being; so also, Kānyakubja, Kāśi and Ayodhyā are known to have fallen.

[4] I.e., between Taṃsu and Ailina-Duṣmanta.

[5] From Śaśabindu son of Citraratha and Mahiṣmant son of Sāhañja, to Jyāmagha and Durjaya and Supratīka (an interval of between 13 to 20 steps).

[6] Br. 13, 51-55; Hariv. 32, 1714-1721.

[7] Vāyu : 99, 121-133.

[8] Mat. 49, 7—10; Mbh. 1, 94, 3704 ff.

[9] Viṣ. IV, 19, 2; Ag. 277, 4b-6a.

[10] Collated proto-text :—
Matinārāt Sarasvatyāṃs trayo' jāyanta dhārmikāḥ/Taṃsur ādyo' pratiratho Dhruvas câpratimadyutiḥ/sarve veda-vidas tatra brāhmaṇāḥ satyavādinaḥ*/Gaurī kanyā ca vikhyātā Māndhātur jananī tathā/(putro' pratirathasyâsit Kaṇvaḥ sa nâbhavan nṛpaḥ/ Medhātithiḥ sutas tasya tasmāt Kāṇvo'bhavad dvijaḥ)**
Ilinā nāma yasyâsīt kanyā vai janamejayā
(*Or* Ilinā nāma câsyâsīt kanyā vai janamejayā.
Or Ilinā nu yamī syâsīt kanyā yâjanayat sutān.
Or Ilinânupamā tvāsit kanyā yâjanayat sutān.
Or Ilinā tu pitur āsīt kanyā sâjanayat sutān.
Or Ilinā Matinārasya kanyā sâjanayat sutān.
brahma-vādiny adhistrī ca Tamsus tām abhyagacchata*/Tamsoḥ Surodho rājarṣir Dharmanetro pratāpavān/brahma-vādī parākrāntas tasya bhāryOpadānavi*/ Upadānavī sutām lebhe caturas tvAilinātmajān/Duṣmantam atha Suṣmantam Pravīram Anagham tathā.

* In Brahma and Hariv. texts only.

** May or may not be spurious.

"Sarasvatī, three virtuous sons were born, viz., Taṃsu, the "eldest Apratiratha, and Dhruva, all of whom were truthful "Brāhmaṇs learned in the Veda; and (he had) a famed "daughter, Gaurī, the mother of Māndhātṛ" [here occur two lines (with variants, in all the three texts), which may be spurious, and wrongly inserted here[1] owing to a probable confusion between two Kaṇvas; but as it stands in the collated text, it need not be so taken, for it rather explains what follows]; "Apratiratha's son was Kaṇva who did not become "king; hence his son Medhātithi-Kāṇva became a 'dvija'"; "but he" (either Matināra, if the intervening passage is spurious, or Apratiratha, if it is an integral part, though even then "he" may well refer to Matināra, as the text is about *him*, and these two lines are by way of explanation only), "(but he) had another daughter named 'Ilinā,' a 'brahma-"vādinī' superior woman, whom Taṃsu married, and who "gave birth to sons (i.e., heirs of the dynasty). In Taṃsu's "line (were) Surodha, the rājarṣi Dharmanetra, etc."—Here it seems clear that Matināra had three sons and two famous daughters, and of these a younger son Taṃsu married his influential sister Ilinā, through whom the Paurava line was continued; if however the doubtful couplet is included, another possibility arises, that Ilinā, instead of being the sister of Taṃsu may have been his niece; in any case the eldest son Apratiratha's line was displaced by a younger branch strengthened by a consanguinous marriage.[2]

The Aikṣvāka case is somewhat simpler. In each of the five texts[3] collated here, the outline genealogy is quite clear: Saṃhatāśva, the 4th predecessor of Māndhātṛ, had two sons, Kṛśāśva and Akṣayāśva, between whom and Prasenajit in the next step is placed Haimavatī-Dṛṣadvatī, a 'famous lady,' the 'wife' and the 'daughter' of *some* of the persons named before her: while repeating this outline list, all the texts have evidently tried to gloss over some unacceptable feature in the relationship of this lady which is left vague.[4] On collation,[5]

---

[1] Cf. Pargiter: AIHT, pp. 225-'28.

[2] The disqualification is apparently due to adoption of 'brāhmaṇ'-hood; 'Kaṇva' might also refer to the blindness of the heir-apparent.

[3] Vāyu: 88, 63-64 and Brahmāṇḍa: III, 63, 65-66,—forming one text; Hariv. 12, 708-'10; Brahma: 7, 89ff; and Siva: VII, 60, 72-'74, forming another.

[4] So also some other passages omit all details regarding Haimavatī: Matsya: 12, 33-34; Hariv. IV, 2, 13.

[5] Collated proto-text:—

Saṃhatāśvo Nikumbhasya suto raṇa-viśāradaḥ
Akṣayāśva-Kṛśāśvau tu Saṃhatāśva-sūtāv ubhau
(a) tayoḥ patnī Haimavatī sa-māturā Dṛṣadvatī.
or tayoḥ patnī Haimavatī sammatā tu Dṛṣadvati.
or tayoḥ patmī Haimavatī satām matād Dṛṣadvatī.
or tayoḥ patnī Haimavatī tasya kanyā } Dṛṣadvati.
pitṛ-kanyā }
vikhyātā triṣu lokeṣu putras câsyāḥ Prasenajit

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

however, it becomes clear that the famous Haimavatī-Dṛṣadvatī was a daughter of Saṃhatāśva, and "in accordance with authoritative sanction" was also the wife of both his sons, Kṛśāśva and Akṣayāśva, so that Prasenajit was *her* son. Here, then, is a case of sister-marriage combined with polyandry: as Prasenajit was the grandfather of the famous Māndhātṛ, it was natural that this questionable feature of the original 'vaṃśa-śloka' was sought to be buried beneath diverse guess readings. It is to be noted that these two Aila and Aikṣvāka sister-marriages occurred in the same period (the latter being the earlier case).[1]

After two important royal marriages with the Paurava and the Yādava dynasties,[2] Saṃhatāśva's line shows another instance of sister-marriage. Māndhātṛ's son Purukutsa married his 'pitṛ-kanyā,' Narmadā,[3]—who was later on, like so many other women of traditional history with names of rivers,[4] fancifully identified with the R. Narmadā,[5] but is simply a princess in all Purāṇic genealogies.[6] In this case, again, there is probably a 'double' sister-marriage, a combination with polyandry, as in the case of Haimavatī 4 steps above: the Brahmāṇḍa text[7] gives the sequence Māndhātṛ—Ambarīṣa (taking the second brother of the lists) = Narmadā—Yuvanāśva......Anaraṇya, etc., instead of the usual sequence Māndhātṛ — Purukutsa = Narmadā—Trasadasyu......Anaraṇya, etc., thus deriving the successors of both Purukutsa and Ambarīṣa from the same sister-wife. As is to be expected, the various texts and readings at this point show signs of omissions and

or (b) tasya Haimavatī kanyā satām matād Dṛṣadvatī
.... (a line prob. lost here) ....
vikhyātā triṣu lokeṣu putras câsyāḥ Prasenajit.
or (c) tasya Haimavatī kanyā tayoḥ patnī Dṛṣadvatī
vikhyātā hi satām matāt putras câsyāḥ Prasenajit.

[1] For Prasenajit's son married Matināra's other daughter Gaurī, an alliance that forms one of the bed-rocks of Purāṇic chronology.

[2] Viz., Yuvanāśva = Gaurī, and Māndhātṛ = Vindumatī.

[3] In the 'pitṛ-vaṃśa' sections of most Purāṇas (Matsya: 15, 25, etc.; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 10, 98.)

[4] E.g., Tapatī; Kāverī; Kauśikī, etc. Cf. the numerous stories (in Pur.°) of princesses being cursed and converted into rivers.

[5] As in Mbh. XV, 20, 549-'50.

[6] Vāyu: 88, 74; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 63, 73; Brahma: 7, 95-'6; Hariv. 12, 714-'5. (Viṣṇu: IV, 3, 6-12, gives an account of how the Nāgas (of the S.W. seaboard, from the context) solicited Narmadā to obtain for them the aid of Purukutsa against invaders, and she accordingly led him forth into the Nāga country in a victorious campaign (N.B.—Māndhātṛ was already in the S.W.); the Nāgas blessed her: 'there shall be no breaking off of thy offspring by Purukutsa'; it seems possible, therefore, that the R. Narmadā derived its name from the 'saviouress' Narmadā.)

[7] Brahmāṇḍa: III, 63, 72 ff.

alterations; a comparison of these suggests a collated text,[1] according to which,—" Of the three sons of Māndhātṛ, "Ambarīṣa's heir was 'another' Yuvanāśva begotten on "Narmadā; his son was Harita, from whom were descended "the Hārī(i)tas, military brāhmaṇs; while Purukutsa's heir was "the famous Trasadasyu, begotten 'subsequently' on Narmadā, "and regarded as his 'own' son: *his* own son was Anaraṇya, "etc." Evidently Narmadā was the wife of both the brothers, either at the same time, or by re-marriage (or 'niyoga'). The Ṛgvedic version of Purukutsa's story, therefore, seems to embody a dynastic fact,[2] viz., that after Purukutsa's death or captivity, his queen (herself of the same royal blood) obtained a son for his race,—and according to the Purāṇic indications, quite normally by her 'husband's' brother, in this case also her own brother.

The next group of instances of sister-marriage occur very much later[3] (21 steps below, according to one version, or 37 steps below, according to another); and these cases belong to the Aikṣvāka line again. According to the Matsya version[4] it was Sagara's grandson Aṃśumat who married ' pitṛ-kanyā ' Yaśodā, who is further specified as ' daughter-in-law of Pañcajana, mother of Dilīpa, and grandmother of Bhagīratha.' But the Brahmāṇḍa[1] distinguishes the ' pitṛ-kanyā '-born Dilīpa from the Dilīpa who was Bhagīratha's father though in the ' pitṛ-vaṃśa ' accounts the two are often mixed up. The genealogies in several Purāṇas[2] make Dilīpa-Khaṭvāṅga the son of ' pitṛ-kanyā ' Yaśodā, making her the wife of Viśva-mahat and ' daughter-in-law ' of Vṛddhaśarman,[3] or wife of the latter.[4] It is possible that both statements are correct; the recurrence of sister-marriages in the two dynasties is too apparent to make this unlikely, and such a statement about the descent of Bhagīratha who was subsequently made into a brāhmaṇical hero, is in itself proof of its authenticity. Repetition of names, even of women, is not unusual in the dynastic lists[5]; and both Aṃśumat and Viśva-mahat (°-saha) may have married sisters named Yaśodā and had sons called Dilīpa,[6]—quite a common princely name.[7]

---

[1] Collated proto-text :—

(A) Purukutsam Ambarīṣam Mucukundaṃ ca viśrutaṃ
Ambarīṣasya dāyādo Yuvanāśvo'paraḥ smṛtaḥ
Narmadāyāṃ samutpannaḥ sammatāyāṃ tadātmajaḥ
(*or* Narmadāyāṃ samutpannaḥ sambhūtas tasya câtmajaḥ
Harito Yuvanāśvasya Hāritāḥ śūrayaḥ smṛtāḥ
ete hy Āṅgirasaḥ pakṣāḥ kṣātrôpetāḥ dvijātayaḥ
Purukutsasya dāyādas Trasadasyur mahāyaśāḥ
Narmadāyām athotpannaḥ sammatas tasya câtmajaḥ
(*or* Narmadāyām athotpannaḥ san-matād tasya câtmajaḥ
or Narmadāyām athotpannas tv Amba(u)riṣasya câtmajaḥ)
sambhūto'syâtmajaḥ putro hy Anaraṇyaḥ pratāpavān
or (B) Purukutsam Ambariṣam Mucukundam ca viśrutaṃ
Narmadāyāṃ samutpannās teṣāṃ sambhūya câtmajāḥ
Ambarīṣasya dāyādo Yuvanāśvo'paraḥ smṛtaḥ
Harito Yuvanāśvasya.....................dvijātayaḥ
Purukutsasya........................prātāpavān.

[2] This would make the hypothesis of 2 Purukutsas and Trasadasyus largely unnecessary; 'Durgaha' and 'Girikṣit' offer no real difficulty, as these are simply obvious epithets of an unapproachable conqueror of the hilly S. W., whither Māndhātṛ was led by his wars and Yādava marriage; cf. 'Trasadasyu,' an epithet derived from similar circumstances, used as a name.

[3] But a few steps below, in the time of Hariścandra-Aikṣvāka, there was apparently a dynastic custom and a 'ṛṣi' practice, of sister-marriage (and other incestuous connections) permitted for the sake of offsping (vide "Purāṇic' gāthā quoted in Ait. Brā.). That Hariścandra was effectively advised with regard to attainment of offspring by the ṛṣis Nārada and Parvata, occurs in the present Purāṇic texts also; but the recommendation of incest is not there, as in the older 'gāthā' text. It would seem as if the original bardic account of Hariścandra's life and times has been retouched in questionable details by subsequent brāhmaṇisation.

[4] Matsya: 15, 18-19.

Viśa-saha's sister-marriage was not however an isolated instance. At the 5th or 4th step[8] in his line, the famous Daśaratha seems to have contracted such a marriage with 'Kauśalyā ' who can only have been a sister or a first cousin[9] (paternal uncle's daughter), probably the former, as the cumulative evidence suggests.[10] It is to be noted that a Kauśalyā in the genealogies always means a daughter of the Kośala king (of Ayodhyā),[11] and never wife of a Kośala king, pure and simple; and appellations of similar formation, elsewhere in traditional accounts, have invariably and precisely the same import.[12] This gives added significance to the alleged succession trouble amongst Daśaratha's sons by his several wives: the rights of ' pure ' dynastic blood could not be finally suppressed. Thus it becomes clear that the later Kāvya version of the Rāmāyaṇa is wrong in its statements about Rāma,[1] and the Buddhist reference[2] that makes Rāma brother and husband of Sītā is historically right, in view of all this collective evidence. The origin of the modified version discloses itself in Sītā's appellation 'janaka-duhitā' which need only be compared with the 'pitṛ-kanyā' of numerous other instances; the transition from the substantive 'janaka' in what was probably the old basic genealogical śloka, to the proper name 'Janaka,' was a very easy one, and had the merit of supplying a plausible and honourable connection for the subsequently deified tribal hero, while removing the objectionable feature smoothly.[3]

---

[1] Brahmāṇḍa : III, 63, 166; 181-182; 10, 90 ff.

[2] E.g., Vāyu : 88, 180-182; Brahmāṇḍa : III, 63, 166; 181-182; 10, 90 ff; in both, the misreadings ' putrikasya,' ' putrikāsī,' ' putrikasyāṃ,' etc., are obvious tamperings with ' pitṛ-kanyā,' and may date from a time when the ' pitṛ-vaṃśa ' explanation had not yet been devised.

[3] The names are variously read.

[4] Liṅga : I, 66, 31.

[5] This has led to fables about the same 'apsaras'es, Ghṛtācī, etc., being mothers of different kings in the same dynasty.

[6] Unless the two Dilīpas are identified, from the standpoint of dynastic synchronisms; this point however still requires clearing up.

[7] There was a Paurava Dilīpa also, before Pratīpa, besides these two.

[8] According as ' Dīrghavāhu ' is taken as a name or epithet.

[9] This would probably shock those who have imbibed in good faith the *medieval* Rāmāyaṇic tradition.

[10] See the preceding cases, and also infra.

[11] Except in those very few cases where Kośalan titles were used by conquerors of Kośala. (vide infra).

[12] See infra, the case of Pṛṣatī or Pārṣatī.

For 27 steps after this[4] no sister-marriages are indicated in the dynastic accounts.[5] Then we find several cases again, only one or two steps above the Bhārata war. The Vāśiṣṭha Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana-Vyāsa's son Suka (the hero of many edifying brāhmaṇical didactic tales) married 'pitṛ-kanyā' Pīvarī[1] (who was anxious to obtain a worthy husband),—just as, generations ago, the great Bhārgava brāhmaṇ, Sukra-Uśanas, married a sister. Though comparatively fewer instances of sister-marriages are recorded of brāhmaṇ families, this is no indication of their rarity among them,[2] but is merely due to the fact that it was only in exceptional cases of intimate contact with important ruling princes (like that of Śukra with Yayāti and Vyāsa with the Kauravas, etc.), on which much of traditional history turned, that such details about priestly marriage-relations were recorded; for as a rule the brāhmaṇ families kept no genealogies,[3] and whatever traditions are found about their sex-relations, show that they were much more unfettered and loose in these, than the ruling nobility.[4] The other two instances somewhat less definite, are amongst these latter, Pāñcālas and Yādavas, in the same generation as Suka and Pīvarī (or Kṛtvī). Drupada apparenty married his sister, and his sons and daughters, at least some of them, were by her, probably including Dhṛṣṭadyumna and Draupadī. A full account of Drupada's family is given in the Mahābhārata,[5] where it is stated that, intent on avenging Droṇa's insult, and dissatisfied with his existing children, Drupada, for the sake of a suitable son, had a sacrifice performed by the Kāśyapas Yāja and his brother, who then summoned the Queen Pṛṣatī[1] (or Pārṣatī) to the sacrifice, to "accept the offspring," but she raised some objections, whereupon Dhṛṣṭadyumna and Draupadī were miraculously produced without her, but were regarded as the Queen's own children. Putting aside the fable, it seems clear enough that Drupada's queen was Pṛṣatī (or Pārṣatī), and she was, potentially, adoptively, or actually, mother of Draupadī and Dhṛṣṭadyumna, and she was also, the 'mahiṣī' (Drupada having apparently other wives), for she was summoned to the sacrifice.[2] Now Drupada himself was well-known as 'Pārṣata,' being Pṛṣata's son[3]; and 'Pṛṣatī' (or 'Pārṣatī') can only mean daughter or grand-daughter of Pṛṣata; thus Draupadī herself is, in the same connexion, called 'Pārṣatī'[4] (daughter of Pārṣata = Drupada) or 'Pārṣatasya svasā'[5] (sister of Pārṣata = Dhṛṣṭadyumna). Hence Drupada-Pārṣata's wife Pṛṣatī (Pārṣatī) was his sister. The other case is not equally clear: Satrājit the Vṛṣṇi, a near relative and a father-in-law of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, is said to have had ten sister-wives (or sisters as wives), who bore him a hundred children[6]; they may have been his own sisters and half-sisters. But according to another less reliable version[7] these ten wives were the daughters of the Kekaya king[8]; while yet another version omits all details[1] and notes only the ten wives and a hundred children,—evidently because something was felt to be unseemly here, in the line of the deified hero Kṛṣṇa's father-in-law. A collation of all the modified and senselessly corrupted texts,[2] however, makes Satrājit's polygamous sister-marriage obvious.[3] It is noteworthy that 'sisters as wives' without any distinct possessive reference occurs in another case in the same family, where Bhajamāna, a son of Sātvata (from whom Satrājit was also descended, and who himself apparently contracted a sister-marriage),[4] is stated to have married a 'Sṛñjayī,' whose son Vāhya(ka) married the two daughters of 'Sṛñjaya' (or probably the same 'Sṛñjayī'), being 'bhaginyau' (sisters), and begat children on the 'ārya(ā)-bhaginī' (elder sister).[5] Here 'bhaginī' might refer either to the two wives as each other's sisters, or to them as own (or step-) sisters of their husband,—while in any case they were his 'cousin-sisters' (also called 'bhaginī's)[6]; this ignoring of a sure confusion shows that 'full' sister-marriages were also recognized by these Yādava genealogies,[7] even if such a marriage may not be clearly indicated in this particular case. A collation of the various texts, however, leaves little doubt on this point.[8] This probability increases when we find the above-mentioned Sātvata

---

[1] As in fact in many other genealogical particulars, as compared with the consensus of Purāṇic traditions.

[2] Cowell: Jāt, IV, 78-82. It is to be noted that an early Buddhist version would originate in Kośala itself, and as Buddha himself belonged to the Kośala dynasty (though probably a branch one), there can have been no motive of disparagement in such a statement; besides sister-marriages and first-cousin marriages were not unknown in early Buddhistic period. The Jātaka tradition indeed is based on the very early Purāṇic, and it is quite likely that some real pieces of historical fact have been better preserved here than in later Brāmaṇical works like the Rāmāyana, having been taken out of the earlier 'Purāṇa' (9th Cent. B.C.), within 3 or 4 centuries of its collation. (N.B.—The Kāśmīrian version of Sītā's descent is a confusion between several popular cycles of stories connected with Rāvaṇa, and cannot be regarded as being drawn from authentic Purāṇic tradition.)

[3] The nature of the transition is well illustrated by a popular stanza of an apparently unknown medieval Bengali 'Kavi' (ex tempore epic and purāṇic dramatiser), which is intended to serve as an encomium as well as a denunciation on Rāma at the same time:—"Janama tomāra ativipule/Bhuvana-vidita Ajera kule/Janaka duhitā vivāha kari/Tāhāte bhāsāle yaśera tarī." Evidently here is a trace of the earlier Buddhistic tradition (which lingered longest in Bengal). Many of the statements of Rāmāyaṇa will have to be examined in the light of Purāṇic traditions and historical probabilities suggested by these latter: e.g., in the process of modernization and rounding angles, Sīradhvaja may have been hit upon as a suitable 'janaka' for the 'janaka-duhitā,' because of the connection between 'sītā' and 'sīra'; 'sayonijā Sītā' of original texts may have been made into mythical 'ayonijā' Sītā,' etc.; one basis of identification of Sītā with Janaka's dtr. was probably the story of Vedavatī, dtr. of Kuśadhvaja (of Mithilā apparently), outraged by a 'Rāvaṇa': Rām. VII, 17.

[4] The period may ultimately prove shorter, when all the synchronisms have been more thoroughly examined; the present estimate is based on the taking of the 'solar' lines as the standard, and so there is room for corrections.

[5] Except another instance (noted infra) among the Yādavas of Mathurā-Śūrasena in the generation next to Rāma, apparently under Kośalan influence.

---

[1] In the 'pitṛ-vaṃśas' generally; Harivaṃśa: 23, 1242-'3, where she is called Kṛtvī and a 'pitṛ-kanyā' (the variation in the name but consistence in the epithet showing that it is a 'sister' who is referred to); also called Go: Matsya: 15, 5-10 (where her daughter is called Kṛtvī and mother of Brahmadatta; but Brahmadatta's maternal grandfather Śuka must be a different person from Vyāsa's son,—though as Vyāsa is said to have begotten Śuka on a 'Śukī' called Ghṛtācī or Araṇi, the same family may be indicated by both references). It is quite likely that the wives of Jaigīṣavya (85) and Kāśyapa Asita (91), Ekapaṭalā and Ekaparṇā, were the daughters of an actual brother-sister marriage, of Menā and Himavant, whoever they may have been. Cf. Parigter: AIHT pp. 69-70; 192. Cf. also n. 5 p. 75.

[2] Cf. the definite Āṅgirasa instance noted ante, and other indications dealt with there. In the mythological case of Skanda's children (the 'grahas'), amongst whom the brothers are said to have been husbands to the sisters, (Mbh. § 502 (Skandop°): III, 230) it is admissible to recognize a reflection of primitive 'ṛṣi' customs or Atharvavedic (hence Bhṛgvāṅgirasa) ideas (it is interesting to compare Rv. X, 162 and VI, 55, 4),—as the myth is a continuation of the brāhmaṇical story of the six divorced wives of the Ṛṣis (Bhṛgu, Aṅgiras, etc.), to whom Skanda is affiliated, and as it falls properly within the scope of that strongly brāhmaṇical Veda.

[3] The so-called 'ṛṣi-vaṃśas' being much later attempts at compiling some account out of hearsay, achieve nothing else but a list of Gotras and a few Pravaras, jumbled up without historical order; probably these emulative attempts were due to the Purāṇas having subseqüently passed into the custody of the brāhmaṇs after the Bhārata battle.

[4] See instances infra.

[5] Mbh. § 218 (Caitraratha.°: Drau.°-sambh.°): 1, 167.

---

[1] Pṛṣati: Mbh. I, 6390; Pārṣatī: Mbh. I, 6405.

[2] Cf. 'Kauśalyā' being the chief queen of Daśaratha; or 'pitṛ-kanyā' Yaśodā being the 'śreṣṭhā' wife of Aṃśumat (Matsya: 15, 28); it is possible that the rank belonged to the sister-wife by customary right (cf. the ritual precedence of the sister over the wife in Ait. Brā.); the much discussed 'Subhadrike Kāmpīlavāsini, etc.,' may after all refer to a Kāmpīla princess of blood, the sister-wife and 'mahiṣī' of the Kāmpīla king (it is well known that Yv. ceremonials often refer to the Kuru and Pāñcāla courts).

[3] In all Epic and Purāṇic genealogical accounts; cf. his several appellations derived from Pṛṣata.

[4] Mbh. I, 6434; 7326; III, 215; V, 5520; 5565. Pṛṣata's predecessor (interval uncertain) Somaka's chief queen was also a 'Pārṣati'; this implies that there was an earlier Pṛṣata before Somaka who too married a sister; in that case this instance of sister-marriage would have to be placed shortly after Rāma-Dāśarathi and Sāttvata's cases (vide infra).

[5] Mbh. II, 2349.

[6] 'Daśa-svasṛbhyo bhāryābhyaḥ Satru(ā)jittaḥ śataṃ sutāḥ': Vāyu: 96, 53. There are a number of variant readings, all of which are clearly tamperings that have nevertheless failed to obscure the original 'svasṛ' and 'bhāryā.'

[7] Matsya: 45, 17—19.

[8] In that case they would not be 'svasāraḥ' proper, but cousins of Satrājit, his mother (or a near ancestress) being a Mādrī (Matsya: 45, 1 ff; Brahmāṇḍa: III. 71, 18 ff) = Kaikayī; (Madra, Kekaya and Vāhlīka are often indifferently used in the genealogies; but these local particulars are unreliable in the case of the ill-kept Yādava ones).

---

[1] Hariv. 39, 2076; Brahma: 15, 45; these are of course emended versions with a late Kṛṣṇa-ite bias.

[2] Two source-texts may be distinguished here: (1) Vāyu:—'Daśa-svasṛbhyo bhāryābhyaḥ Satrājittaḥ śataṃ sutāḥ'; (2) Brahma: Hariv: Brahmāṇḍa:—
Daśa-svasrṣu Satrājid-bhāryāsv āsan
Satrājito daśa-svasṛ-bhāryās tāsāṃ
śataṃ sutāḥ' ('tvāsan' being an obvious emendation for 'svasṛ.')

[3] In the same family and generation Jayanta is said to have married Jayantī, whose son was Śubha (Padma: V, 13, 99-100; for the names cf. Āhuka and his sister Āhukī in the same group); this too would seem to be a case of sister-marriage.

[4] Vide infra.

[5] Vāyu: 96, 2-6; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 71, 3-6; Hariv. 38, 1999-2003; Brahma: 15, 30-34; Matsya: 44, 47-50.

[6] So also, Duḥśalā is 'bhaginī' of the Pāṇḍavas in the Epic.

[7] Which do not lack instances of other varieties of consanguinous and incestuous marriages.

[8] The Hariv. and Brahma text is evidently drawn up so as to evade the troublesome points. The Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and Matsya texts with their variants may be thus collated:

"Bhajamānasya Sṛñjayyāṃ
Vāhyakaścopavāhyakaḥ
Vāhyakāyāṃ ca Vāhyakaḥ

"Sṛñjayyāśca
"Sṛñjayasya
sute dve tu Vāhyakas te udāvahat

"tasya bhārye bhaginyau
dve suṣuvāte
te prāsūyātāṃ
sutān vahūn......

"ye Vāhyād ārya-Sṛñjayyāṃ Bhājamānād vijajñire....(Ayutājit, etc.).
"Vāhyād anya-bhaginyāṃ ye Bhājamānād vijajñire.....
(teṣāṃ Devāvṛdho rājā, etc.)."

(son of Satvant and grandson of Jantu) marrying a 'Sātvatī Kauśalyā '[1] (or perhaps better, a 'Sātvatī' *and* a 'Kauśalyā'). This Jantu[2] married an Aikṣvākī (Kauśalyā),; their son Satvant also[2] married a Kauśalyā, evidently a 'cousin-sister': and *their* son Sātvata, again, married 'Sātvatī Kauśalyā.' Here it is clear that this 'Sātvatī' can only have been Sātvata's sister[3]; and if she is the same person as 'Kauśalyā,' then this latter appellation can be explained as loosely applied owing to her being descended from a number of 'Kauśalyā's married into the family every generation,[4]—or by the fact of traditional history that Sātvata had reconquered the Yādava possessions lost to Rāma and established his dominion over a portion of the fallen Kośala kingdom,[5] so that the Kośalan titles could be used by his family[6]; but a collation of the texts would suggest that *two* different wives of Sātvata and their children have been confused, and that originally the son of one of them was distinguished as 'bhāginya,' i.e., 'sister-born.'[7] In any case, Sātvata contracted a sister-marriage; and this is significant in view of the fact that he is a younger contemporary of Rāma-Dāśarathi,[8] in whose family there were several sister-marriages in that period,[9] and with whose family that of Sātvata had intermarried frequently.[10]

If the Bhārata battle is taken to have occurred in about 950 B.C. roundly (a quite moderate and reasonable inference from the facts of traditional history), these last instances of sister-marriage would be assigned to cir. 1000 B.C.,—by which time almost all the Ṛgvedic sūktas had been composed and were awaiting final compilation. In the light of these facts, the references in the Ṛgveda to sister-marriages become more intelligible, and their significance gains perceptibly.

---

[1] Vāyu: 95, 47; 96, 34.

[2] Matsya: 44, 45-47; Brahma: 15, 27-30 and Hariv. 37, 1994-2000, make Satvant son of Madhu (instead of Jantu), but retain the Aikṣvākī mother.

[3] Cf. 'Pṛṣatī' and 'Kauśalyā' above.

[4] So that she had almost as much of Kośala blood as Yādava.

[5] Hariv. 95, 5242-8; along with Vāyu: 88, 185-6; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 63, 186-7; etc.; also cf. Hariv. 55, 3060-96.

[6] Cf. the case of the Haihayas Bhadraśreṇya, Supratīka, etc.; the later case of the Kāśi princesses Ambā, etc., being called Kauśalyās as well; there was an Auśinara King of Kāśi; cf. also the converse case of Rohiṇī-Pauravī (w. of Vasudeva) who should have been called Rohiṇī-Mādrī or -Vāhlīki.

[7] The best collation would be:
"Sātvatī Sātvatāj jajñe divyam Devāvṛdhaṃ nṛpaṃ
"bhāginyam, Bhajamānaṃ ca Kauśalyā suṣuve sutaṃ."
(It is possible however to read 'Kauśalyān,' taking it as adj. to 'sutān.')

[8] Vide n. 5 above.

[9] Vide pp. 125-126 above.

[10] Vide n. 6 above.

Rv. VI, 55, which shows ‘ ṛṣi ’ approval of incestuous connexion with sister (and mother), reflects the same state of custom and opinion as the old ‘ gāthā ’ (in Ait. Brā.) referring to the time of Hariścandra-Aikṣvāka,—which agrees fully with the actual occurrence of sister-marriages amongst the Aikṣvākas on either side of Hariścandra, and amongst ‘ ṛṣi ’ families,—and is thus a very early reference. Rv. X, 162 also is comparatively early, as it is an Atharvavedic domestic charm, and as its evidence regarding the prevalence of such connexions, at least in the brāhmaṇ society contemplated by that Veda, agrees with the early cases amongst the same groups (Bhṛgus, Aṅgirasas, etc.), as noticed in ‘ tradition.’ But Rv. X, 10, which shows the rise of better opinion (and some conflict of opinion also), is clearly later[1] than those two; hence it is best viewed as a ‘ vākovākya ’ or Purāṇic dialogue, of the character of a social drama on a small scale[2] with a moral; it is significant that the typical example selected for the moral dialogue belongs to the very earliest stage of the traditional dynastic history of the Aikṣvākas (and Ailas) : this indicates that the author knew Purāṇic traditions well,[3] and that the piece was probably intended for the reform of some Mānva (or Aila) court and its attached priesthood[4];—all this again, points to the time of its composition as being close to that of the bringing together of priestly and bardic lore in ‘ saṃhitā’s by Vyāsa and his disciples.

From this time (i.e. 1000—950 B.C. downwards), the Purāṇic tradition does not refer to any further sister-marriages. Though it notes some few details about subsequent dynasties for a century more down to cir. 850 B.C., for the succeeding period (850 to Magadhan ascendancy) it gives only the bare political facts and lists of kings, without personal details; yet there must have existed a mass of traditional history for these times, of which the stories about the kings contemporary with and preceding Buddha are surviving traces. Then in the early Buddhistic texts,—which though fixed and canonized much later, can very well be taken as evidence for the 6th and 7th cents. B.C.,—we get once again some references to sister-marriage (along with other primitive forms).

An important question is raised here: Is this recrudescence in the Buddhistic literature only similar to what the previous dynastic history in the Purāṇas reveal,—or is it the effect of some external influence and change in social elements?

---

[1] This is also implied by its unknown authorship and subsequent ascription to the very persons who form its subject-matter.

[2] Cf. the similar character of ‘ Purūravas-Urvaśī ’, and other pieces.

[3] Just as about 250 years later, the Aitareya made use of an earlier Purāṇic compilation (probably the one of 9th cent. B.C.).

[4] So also, the reverse teaching of the (Purāṇic) ‘ gāthā ’ in the Aitareya is for the benefit of the Mānva King Hariścandra, put in the mouth of ṛṣis patronised by him.

The interval between the last Purāṇic-Vedic instances and the Buddhistic references is not too long to make the first view improbable, when similar previous intervals are compared. In fact these intervals of no information are no proofs against such practices, and the recrudescences may as well be taken as marking a continuity in dynastic or priestly custom. If the Purāṇa had not been closed, the continuity would in all probability have been well illustrated: it is indeed indicated by the fragments of non-Purāṇised tradition embodied in the Buddhistic texts. These Buddhistic texts are not all 'Buddhistic': among them are echoes from the older Purāṇic traditions regarding the pre-Bhārata times, such as Rāma's marriage with his sister Sītā,[1] or Kṛṣṇā's twin brother's marriage with his mother's daughter by her second husband[2]; or again, allusion is made to dynastic details at some stage or other in the post-Bhārata and pre-Buddhistic period,—such as the Kāśi prince Udayabhadra's becoming the heir-apparent by his marriage with his half-sister Udayabhadrā, who proved a most devoted wife[3]; while another reference might belong to Buddha's own times, such as the proud admission of the Sākyas (a section of the Aikṣvākās)

---

[1] Cowell: Jātakas: IV, 79-82, etc.; vide also ante, *re* earlier sister-marriages in Rāma's line (sp. pp. 125-126 and n. 2 & 3, p. 126).

[2] Acc. to the Jātaka version, Draupadī and her brother were really children of the vanquished Kośala King, their mother having been abducted and married by the victorious 'Kāśi' King, during her pregnancy; after the birth of the twins, the son was for safety brought up in secrecy away from the King's household, while the daughter was recognized as his own; subsequently the boy fell in love with his mother's daughter by her second consort, and being caught in her company and recognized, was duly married to his half-sister (vide Cowell: Jātakas: V, 226, etc.).

These dynastic details agree very well with those in the Epic and Purāṇas *re* the Pāñcāla line: Drupada himself married a sister, and his ancestor Somaka did the same (vide ante); so it is quite likely that Dhṛṣṭadyumna also contracted a similar alliance, and the practice was in accordance with Pāñcāla dynastic tradition. (Cf. also the 'miraculous birth' of Drau.°, and Dhṛṣṭa.° in the Epic).

The selection was made after a good deal of search for a girl after the likings of Udayabhadra. The story makes them rather unwilling parties to the marriage at first; but this is probably an addition, as the subsequent portion of it shows: after the brother's death the sister continued to rule the country, and firm in chastity could not be seduced by others, as she longed for reunion with her lord and brother Udaya; subsequently she abdicated, retired as a recluse, and "became the wife of Udaya again"; "in fact she was Buddha's cousin-wife in a later birth." (Cowell: Jātakas: IV, 67).

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preseyation Foundation, Chandigarh

that amongst them men ordinarily consort with their sisters.[1] Hence a continuity of the custom seems to be clearly indicated during the interval in question.

On the other hand, the Persian expansion into India from the first half of the 6th century B.C. onwards, makes it very probable that kindred Irāṇian court-'fashions'[2] were taken up in Indian aristocratic circles at that period or even somewhat earlier. This does not imply anything like Spoonerian Zoroastrianisation. The Purāṇic tradition helps us in viewing the so-called Irāṇian influences in their proper perspective. It looks upon these Trans-Indus peoples of the far West and North-West, as being originally Aila (and partly Aikṣvāka)[3] communities, that migrated (or were pushed back) thither from Madhya-deśa (along with other offshoots to the S. W., etc.), at sundry times, but chiefly during the period from Yayāti to Uśīnara (cir. 1900—1650 B.C. in Purāṇic computation). And throughout the traditional history of the pre-Bhārata age they are never wholly lost sight of, at least the more easterly sections of them,—though often termed 'barbarians,' etc. Indeed it seems very probable that the various 'barbarian' inroads[4] from the N. W. and W. referred to in dynastic history, e.g., *temp.* Kuśika, the Haihayas and Sagara (cir. 1650—

---

[1] Cowell : Jātakas : V, 219. (In a tribal quarrel the Kolīyas charged the Śākyas with having this incestuous custom : the Śākyas retorting, acknowledged it, saying that these sister-marrying Śakyas were mightier men than the Kolīyas.)

[2] Every student of history knows that many West Asiatic dynasties cherished the custom of sister-marriage, e.g., the Ptolemide and earlier Egyptian dynasties, the Achamenians and Sassanides, etc.

[3] Thus a section of the Mānvas is said to have migrated beyond the Punjāb and become known as Śakas; and the Druhyu-ite sections of the Ailas beyond Gāndhārā came to be called Yavanas. [Q.—Has the alternative name Dranghiānā of Siestān and Arachosia (acc. to the Gks.) a connection with Druṅghu (Druhyu)?] [This Purāṇic tradition re migration of Mānva and kindred tribes westward to the Punjab and adjacant countries early in the 2nd millennium or in the 3rd millennium B.C., seems to be substantially correct from the nature of the Harappa and Mahenjo Daro excavations of 1924].

[4] Of Śakas, Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Pāradas and Pahlavas, forming one group,—and of Nāgas, Ābhiras, and Niṣādas, forming another group,—who invaded Madhyadeśa with the Haihayas. The Śakas, etc., who came from the highlands beyond the Seven Rivers : the first group would thus represent purer Ailas, Airyas, or the Irānians proper); while the second group, coming by way of the sea, the lower Indus and Sarasvatī, up to Gujrat, Rājputānā and the Punjāb, would consist of various races with non-Āryan affinities (probably partly Elamites, Sumerians and Semites of the Red and Arabian sea-coasts, who had pre-historic connections with the Dravidians and the S. W. of India). The notion that every occurrence of Śakas and Yavanas refers to the Kushāns and Bactrian Greeks, must be modified : these names quite naturally came to be applied to all invaders from the Western regions beyond the Indus, whither the *original* Śakas and Yavanas had migrated from India.

1450 B.C.), or on the eve of and after the Bhārata war (cir. 1050—850 B.C.),—were of these ousted members of the Indo-Āryan stock, in the tide of return. In the social history of the early Indian ruling classes and connected priesthoods, therefore, the periodic reappearance of primitive types of sex-relations may have been, in some cases at least, due to strains of 'barbarian' (W. Aila or Irāṇian) blood and practices[1] from time to time;—and the Irāṇian expansion and influence of the 6th century B.C. would seem to have been merely a repetition of history. Hence few things absolutely foreign to Indian culture and traditions could have been introduced by it; and if as a result of the Persian conquests there were any social changes, these would be mainly reversions to, or modifications of those common features of Indo-Irāṇian (i.e., early Aila) culture, which may have been retained longer, or specially developed, in the Irāṇian or (Druhyu-ite) sections. It thus becomes intelligible how Persian influence in the early Buddhistic period could have led to a revival (however temporary or limited) of extreme consanguinous marriages. Similarly, the 'sale of brides' and 'exposure platforms' at Taxila in the Persian period would be based on, and revivals of, the 'asura' custom of bride-selling as praticed (in the same area) by the Madras of tradition[2] 'from time immemorial,' and the sporadic usage of exposing the dead as noticed in Vedic texts. All the so-called Persian features may be thus viewed and explained through 'tradition,' without any far-fetched theory. That the Kṣatriyas of Kapila-vāstu and Vaiśālī were foreign races from Tibet or some other unknown land who developed a new and a crude type of religion and culture, would be a supposition too fanciful and superficial to be entertained in this connection. The Purāṇic tradition knows the Śākyas as a part of or offshoots from the old Aikṣvāka race of Kośala, and Vaiśālī and Videha as continuing under the rule of cognate Mānva families down to the close of the 5th cent. B.C.: while all that is known about the early history of Jainism and Buddhism show that they began as enlightened movements for betterment and reform in all directions, and arose from within the existing elements; the only external influence that may be suggested to have worked, can be the rapid expansion of Persia at the expense of India,—which

---

[1] Cf. Padma: V, 74, 15; where it is said that consanguinous and incestuous connexions are characteristic of the 'mlecchas' and 'daityas', whose speech is 'Paiśācikī' (an Indo-Irāṇian dialect).

[2] Even if the Taxilan bride-selling is taken as a Mesopotamian feature this would be there as much because there were earlier West-Asiatic connections (through sea-faring Niṣādas who traded in girls at the Western ports, and Nāgas who ruled at Takṣa-śilā on the eve of and after the Bhārata war), as on account of inter-migration of institutions within the heterogenous Persian Empire.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

must have given some sort of an impetus towards improving existing conditions. Buddhism or Jainism in themselves, therefore, cannot be supposed to have introduced primitive or consanguinous types of marriage; they were rather a source for purity and higher standards in sex-relations (as in many other lines of life and conduct). The so-called high Hindu ethics and personal morality of subsequent periods, is very largely a Buddhistic achievement,—a lasting reform and refinement, inherited by later forms of Brāhmaṇism.

The above Buddhistic references are thus partly echoes from, and continuations of, the Purāṇic tradition,—partly a reflection of lingering practices,—and possibly in part indications of some Irāṇian influence (consisting in direct court examples and indirect preparation of an atmosphere for revivals of ancient and common Indo-Irāṇian (Aila) customs that were gradually falling into disuse in India after the Bhārata war).

Incestuous marriages, however, must have continued far enough into the Buddhistic period to make it possible for the Indianised dynasty of Siam to have or retain a custom of sister-marriage by preference, even in later medieval times. Ruling families and priesthoods intimately connected with them, have always lagged behind the line of popular progress in such points of culture; and in ancient history generally we find them sticking to obsolete and primitive customs: this is equally true of India.[1] The late and not uncommon performance[2] of the revoltingly primitive rite of the Aśvamedha, in spite of early protests from Kṣatriya kings (like Janamejaya-Pārikṣita II, cir. 900 B.C.),[3] and subsequently from the Jaina-Buddhist reformers, shows the tenacity of old barbaric practices and their continuance even after a much higher level of culture was attained generally. And thus it must have been with sister-marriage and other crude types of relationship.

---

[1] Where on either side of what may be called the real 'higher classes' have existed remnants of earlier stages of culture: with the ruling aristocracy and connected priesthood on the one hand and the gradually āryanised aborigines on the other.

[2] E.g. In the Śuṅga and Gupta periods.

[3] Cf. Hariv. 192. 11092 ff.; 195-'6. 11236-'69.

II

PARENTAL INCEST.

Quite in agreement with the Vedic evidence on the point, we find in the Epic-Purāṇic tradition a few plain instances and some indications, of incestuous connexions of this type, some of which might be called marriages.[1]

The mythological reference in the Ṛgveda (X, 61) to the union of Prajāpati with his daughter finds its counterpart in the Purāṇa as well.[2] But whereas in the former the treatment and setting is cosmogonical and allegorical,[3] that in the latter is semi-historical; and it would appear that the Vedic composer, Nābhā(ga)-nediṣṭa Mānava,[4] utilised an ancient and current tradition regarding the first origins of a previous ruling race, probably taken from the 'sūta-māgadha' bardic accounts[5] of the Pṛthu-ite dynasties that flourished in N. E. India during the two centuries (or more) before the rise of the Aikṣvākas and Ailas. According to these accounts,[6] the first famous chiefs in that earlier period, Priyavrata and Uttānapāda, were sons of a 'Manu' who was begotten[7] by 'Brahmā' (= 'Prajāpati,'[8] etc.) on his own daughter Śatarūpā whom he loved.[9] Sometimes it is explained how he

---

[1] One instance is actually taken as a marriage in Mbh.; vide infra.

[2] In the accounts of the origin of the First Dynasty of traditional history (in which Priyavrata, Uttānapāda, Dhruva, Bharata, Veṇa and Pṛthu were the famous names, and which produced several 'Manu's and 'Prajāpati's, and also the first 'Kings' of India and their chroniclers and panegyrists, the Sūtas and Māgadhas.)

[3] Quite in agreement with the usual want of ṛṣi appreciation of historical traditions.

[4] A brother of Ikṣvāku, and progenitor of the Mānvas of Vaiśāli, in the same region where the Pṛthu-ites once ruled, whose beginnings are placed by tradition in the 17th step (i.e. cir. 200 years) before Nābhā(ga)—nediṣṭa.

[5] It is to be noted here that 'Sūta' traditions were older than the Aila-Aikṣvāka period, dating from at least a century before them (i.e., the reign of Pṛthu). (The Purāṇas profess to give one ancient 'Sūta' ballad, *re* Pṛthu's reign).

[6] I.e. the version of them preserved in the Purāṇic compilation of a later age. The interval between the final compilation of Purāṇic tradition (cir. 850 B.C.) and the 1st step of the Pṛthu-ite dynasty would be about 1400 years (=100 steps after Manu+17 steps before him).

[7] With six others : Matsya : 4, 24—32.

[8] Possibly the Vedic legendary version arose out of a confusion between Prajāpati the divine creator and Prajāpati the usual Purāṇic designation of early chieftains, which latter sense, evidently, is to be understood of Priyavrata's grandfather in the dynastic lists.

[9] Matsya : 3, 31-44; etc

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

did not incur guilt by such a connexion, and stories are told of his curse on Kāma, who became later on Pradyumna, and after the Bhārata battle, son of the Vatsa King.[1] This subsequent explanation of the incest is paralleled by the Brāhmaṇa commentaries[2] on Ṛv. X, 61; and the basis of the appended tables was probably similar incests originally also recorded of Pradyumna and the Vatsa prince,[3]—the case of a near ancestor of Pradyumna being actually on record.[4] Another Purāṇic version,[5] however, makes Śatarūpā the wife of Svāyambhuva Manu,[6] instead of the daughter and wife of his father: this is either a subsequent improvement by one step on the older version, or might imply a double incest involving another of the reverse order, which seems to be not altogether unknown to early legend and tradition.[7] A parallel is afforded in the case of Vivasant and Manu, both being called 'Śrāddhadeva,' while Śraddhā is a daughter of the former and wife of the latter.[8] The Ṛgvedic conception of Pūsan as the 'didhiṣu' of his mother,[9] and 'jāra' of his sister,[10] and the 'ṛṣi' advice to Hariścandra (Mānva) that the sister and the mother were permissible wives of one desiring offspring,[11] show that the two statements regarding Śatarūpā are not contradictory.[12] Tradition also supplies similar particulars about the priestly groups: in an Āṅgirasa genealogy (partly tinged with myths), "the maiden Rohiṇī, daughter of Hiraṇyakaśipu" is stated to have become "his 'bhāryā' as a result, of 'karma,'"[13]—which agrees with the fact that the 'Āṅgirasa' Veda also knows of actual cases like this.[1] In this connection the epithet 'Kanyā-Bhartṛ'[2] appears significant, as applied to Skanda in the brāhmaṇical legend of Skanda's birth (of Atharvanic character).

---

[1] Matsya: 4, 1—32.

[2] Ait. Brā. III, 33, 5; etc.

[3] This latter suggested instance would indicate that aristocratic morals had not improved much in the interval between the Bhārata battle and Buddhism. (vide the sec. on sister-marriage).

[4] That of Taittiri and his daughter; vide infra.

[5] Viṣṇu: I, 7, 15-16 (where, as well as in Hariv., the sin is cleansed by Śatarūpā's penances; cf. 'aparūpāṃ' in the corr. Matsya text); Hariv. 2, 54 ff. (prob. 'patnim Śatarūpāmayonijāṃ' in one of these verses is better read as '°sayonijāṃ').

[6] Svāyambhuva Manu is called an 'Āpava' in Hariv. op. cit.; as 'Āpava' is a real clan name in Pur.° tradition (applied to Himā- layan Vāśiṣṭhas), it would seem he was a historical person and not a mere abstraction standing for the first origin of the Pṛthuite dynasty.

[7] Vide infra.

[8] Vide ante, sec. *re* sister-marriage.

[9] Cf. the legend in the Epic, of Mahādeva as Pārvatī's child on her lap: Mbh. XIII, 161.

[10] Vide ante, sec. *re* Vedic evidence on this subject.

[11] Vide n. 10 above.

[12] This is further supported by the fact that Śatarūpā is also called Anantarūpā or Anantā(°ī), and this name is given in some texts to Svāyambhuva Manu's wife; cf. '...aparūpām Anantā nāma...' in the Matsya text. (A similar incest seems to be referred to in some subsequent corrupt lines in the Hariv. text (cited above), about Priyavrata and Kāmyā (next generation); it is to be noted that Aṅga's sister-marriage also belongs to this dynasty.)

[13] Mbh. § 490 (Āṅgirasa): III. 219 20 14194 cf. Nil° comm.°

But apart from very early or semi-legendary instances, tradition also notices much later and actual cases of incests of this type; and it is noteworthy that the two definite occurrences are ascribed to the Vṛṣṇi (Yādava) family,—otherwise remarkable for laxity. Between 6 to 11 steps above Kṛṣṇa in the Vṛṣṇi dynastic lists, was a musician king, Taittiri, who personally instructed his daughter in music, dancing, etc., and becoming enamoured of her, begot a son Nala on that daughter; hence Nala (who succeeded him) was nicknamed 'Nandanôdara-dundubhi.'[4] These details are by no means fanciful, as the dynastic lists wherein they occur, are full of all sorts of natural personal details,[5] and kings instructing their daughters in music and dancing is quite a common thing in the dynastic accounts: thus in the same (S. W.) region and the same (Yādava) group of ruling families, Durjaya (the Haihaya) in an earlier generation taught these arts to his sons and daughters by a 'gandharvī' (i.e., a court dancing-girl)[6]; a few generations below Nala,

[1] Vide ante, *re* Vedic evidence on this subject.

[2] Mbh. III, 14633.

[3] Nearer 6 than 11 (adopted by Pargiter), as all Purāṇas practically agree in the list from Kapotaroman to Kaṃsa.

[4] The full accounts are in Matsya: 44, 62 ff; and Kūrma: I, 24, 49-54; other Purāṇas summarise; some give only the nickname of Nala often in corrupt unmeaning forms (—which makes it possible that Vasudeva's appellation 'Ānaka-dundubhi' is a modification of a nickname like 'Kanyakā-dundubhi,' and points to a repetition of Taittiri's case in the family); and some simply give the succession list without any particulars; for the former cf. Padma: V, 13, 47-51; Viṣṇu: IV, 14, 4; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 71, 117-119; Vāyu: 96, 117; and for the latter, Hariv. 38, 2016-'17, which being a specially Yādava chronicle omits Nala as well as his nickname. Nala also was musical; cf. Viṣṇu above. The words 'susūta' and 'viloman' in the Padma and Viṣṇu list seem to have been descriptive of Nala's parentage in the original verses, rather than separate proper names (i.e. = 'svasutāyaṃ' and 'vilomaja'; cf. Matsya: 44, 63, where 'tanujaḥ sarpo' is obviously a corrupt reading for 'tanujā-garbho(°e).' Vide n. 2. p. 143.

[5] E.g., "Nala's son Punarvasu was born in the middle of the assembly at an Aśvamedha," etc. Matsya: 44, 64-5; etc.

[6] Kūrma: I, 23. 6-44. The daughters subsequently married 'gandharvas' and the sons 'gandharvīs': a detail indicating that the lighter pursuits of the Yādava courts tended to produce a general laxity in their marriage relations. Cf. Purūravas marrying a 'gandharvī', and their sons also doing the same, and associating with 'gandharvas' and 'gandharvis' together with their father: Kūrma: I, 23. 46; for other refs. vide Pargiter: AIHT. p. 297, n. 5-8.

there is the well-known instance of the musical Revata[1] and his favourite daughter (about whose marriage there was some difficulty)[2]; and in the next step there is a somewhat similar case of Arjuna instructing a friendly cousin's daughter Uttarā-Vairāṭī (who evidently became enamoured of him).[3] The probable indication of a parallel to Taittiri's case in the fable about Pradyumna's being 'Kāma' by Brahmā's curse, has already been noticed. Thus the early Vedic references[4] to actual father-daughter connexions are confirmed by the traditional.[5]

Pūṣan's position as 'didhiṣu' of his mother has, however, no 'specified' parallels in tradition, except in the already noted mythical or semi-mythical statements about the two 'Manus,' and the 'gāthā' allusion to the custom in Hariścandra's time which, taken together, would suggest that amongst the Mānvas and connected brāhmaṇ families, there was a practice of transference of the father's wives to the son. But connexions between persons in 'similar' position are specified, and were probably frequent. A clear case is that of Sāmba,[6] son of Kṛṣṇa, whose connexions with his step-mothers[7] are said to have brought Kṛṣṇa's heavy curses[8] on him as well as the wives, the initiative in the affair apparently belonging to Sāmba's 'mothers'[7]; so, also, when Satyabhāmā-Sātrājitī seeks from Draupadī the secret of her power over her five husbands, the latter warns her against talking or staying in private with her step-sons Pradyumna, Sāmba, etc.[9] With this may be compared the story of Arjuna and Urvaśī.[10]

On a careful consideration of all the dynastic relationships described in the Epic, it becomes clear that the stories about the miraculous birth and marriage of the Pāṇḍavas are all late after-thoughts, only of value as showing that after all they were begotten by just the ordinary type of Epic Niyoga or license, and married according to a form not yet totally obsolete—other cases of polyandry being known to the Epic and the Purāṇas, and instances of the raising of offspring by relatives or outsiders, and of illegitimate natural sons, being quite common amongst the ruling and priestly classes of those times.[1] It is thus evident that the fables in the present version of the Epic and Purāṇas regarding the Pāṇḍavas, arose out of actual but (according to later views) discreditable relationships, and it may be possible still to discover traces of what the original facts were like, divested of fabulous garb. Leaving out further details on this point,[2] it may reasonably be taken to have been an 'original' fact of the Pāṇḍava history, that the person (called 'Indra' etc., in the fables), who begot Arjuna by 'niyoga,' received Arjuna in his court,[3] when he left the rest of the family to prepare for the battle, and matereally helped[4] him with arms and training, and also entertained him right royally. The Arjuna-Urvaśī episode comes in here.

---

[1] The Śāryātas (whose priests, too, were Bhṛgus) became early affiliated to the Yādava-Haihayas, and became scattered in the S. W. districts.

[2] In all Purāṇic accounts.

[3] Cf. Mbh., Virāṭaparvan.

[4] Vide ante.

[5] To these may be added a tradition that 'Rāvaṇa' would or did have his daughter by Mandodarī as consort (who was reborn as Sītā).

[6] Varāha: clxvii; cf. Matsya: 70, 2 ff; etc. So also his brother Pradyumna marries his foster-mother Mayavatī, Śambara's wife, who takes the initiative, and discloses to him that she had only nursed him, and did not bear him. (The Purāṇic account tries to show that this doubly unseemly union was justified.)

[7] Kṛṣṇa's wives' and 'Sāmba's mothers,' without any specification.

[8] Of leprosy and prostitution, respectively.

[9] Mbh. §§ 510-11 (Drau.°-Satya.°): III. 233-'35.

[10] Mbh. III, 45-46, 1812—1867.

Shorn of 'pantheonic,' legendary setting, the substance of it is that one Urvaśī, a chief dancing-girl attached to Arjuna's 'father's' court and recognized as being in the status of his 'mother,' became enamoured of Arjuna (who was being instructed in music and dancing in her company),[5] and, with his 'father's' consent, approached him; but she was refused by him on grounds of higher morality[6] (she being 'guru-patnī'), though she pointed out that, in accordance with custom, all Arjuna's forefathers, the great Paurava princes, had accepted precisely similar invitations, without any guilt being attached to them.[7] There are indications that make it probable that the 'father' of Arjuna was a

---

[1] Vide details in secs. *re* polyandry and 'niyoga.'

[2] Cf. infra, sec. on 'niyoga,' *re* Kuntī.

[3] At 'Amarāvatī,' which may well have been a real city (of Central India: vide n. 1, p. 141): so also there was a real Tripura and a Vaibhrāja in traditional history. The transference of the whole scene to Trans-Himālayas is evidently due to the 'Indra' fable.

[4] As noticed later on, the three chief and original supporters of the Kaunteyas are also very likely persons to have been their progenitors by 'niyoga.'

[5] Note the specially Yādava and South-Western feature, and the parallels noted above.

[6] The Epic emphasises the 'great merit of this story of restraint' on the part of a prince; the parallel in the Purāṇas of the 'great merit' that is claimed for Arjuna's great grandson Janamejaya III's story of opposing obscene ceremonials, is striking. This indicates that puritanic stands were exceptional, and laxity and barbarism were the general rule with the Yādava and Paurava ruling classes and their priesthoods

[7] Her curse on Arjuna has a remarkable 'harem' tone, which is probably more than accidental.

Yādava prince related to Kuntī's family, and he may have been Purujit the Kuntibhoja[1]; this would agree fully with what tradition says about the harem life of these Yādava families, wherein such 'artiste'-concubines and lax morals were a chief feature.

These episodes of Sāmba and Arjuna point to an established dynastic custom, amongst the Yādavas and Pauravas,[2] of sons succeeding to the seraglios ('official' or 'non-official') of their father—very late medieval instances of which have been known in India as well as in other countries.[3] The arrangements which were made by Arjuna after the fateful slaughter at Dvāravatī[4] make the probability surer. The wives of the princes who had perished, were divided into three batches, and the three surviving young princes of Kṛṣṇa, Sātyaki and Kṛtavarman's direct lineage succeeded to them, and were established along with them in new principalities. So also Vicitravīrya's wives are proposed by his mother to be transferred[5] as wives to Bhīṣma, who is requested to succeed him—only in this case by exceptional circumstances the proposed successor is an elder brother. So, again, the palaces of Duryodhana, etc., are, after the battle, transferred to Yudhiṣṭhira's brothers, who spend the nights happily there[6] —the inmates of the palaces may have ben transferred too along with them. Such transfers would naturally involve incestuous connexions in the case of direct lineal successions. This is illustrated by the definite statement in Vāts. Kā. Sūt. (referring to practices of the post-Mauryan or possibly a much earlier period) that the princes of Vidarbha (Yādava), in accordance with ancient custom, freely consorted with all their father's wives, excepting their own mother.[7] The later Sūtra dictum, therefore, that property in cattle, land and women, is not destroyed by changing hands,[8] is in part a laconic crystallization of much more ancient customs.

---

[1] Vide n. 1, p. 140.

[2] As apparently among the Mānvas, vide p. 139 above; cf. Cowell: Jāt. VI, 133, for a Magadhan case, apparently of the Epic age, where Dirghavāhu receives his father Arindama's 16,000 wives in marriage.

[3] E.g., the famous medieval case of the Rājput princesses of Guzrāṭ (mother and daughter) being transferred to successive Delhi Emperors.

[4] Mbh. XVI, 7.

[5] Mbh. § 168 (Bhīṣ.° Saty.°): I. 103.

[6] Mbh. §637 (Rājadh.°): XII, 44, 4147-'68.

[7] Vāts. Kā. Sūt. V, 6, 12.

[8] Gautama: XII, 39.

The episode of Uttarā's marriage with Abhimanyu (in the Epic) can now be viewed in the light of these observations: As Arjuna taught Uttarā music and dancing, the first thought that occurs to the court is that they should get married as a natural sequel[1]; in fact Uttarā is described as being clearly in love with Arjuna[2], and she was a fully developed young woman and no toying child[3]; in spite of all this, she is married to Arjuna's son (barely 16), probably younger than herself.[4] These details, therefore, are quite in keeping with the dynastic traits noted by tradition.

The Vedic evidence, considered by itself in a previous section, supplies no definite clue as to the nature and origin of the incestuous sex-relations there referred to. But the complementary evidence of traditional accounts helps in arriving at some reasonable estimate. Taking the two together, it seems clear enough that these references fall mainly into two classes, one referring to semi-historical beginnings of society and mythical personages, the other to actual genealogical facts amongst Vedic (=Epic-Purāṇic) ruling and priestly families,—some of them comparatively late. The former class may admit of mythological interpretations,[5] though that does not explain why such parental incests should have been favourite similes and been at all ascribed to persons, historical or legendary. The second class is evidently historical, and certainly was not the product of a primitive and barbarous community: the Vedic civilization proper had already reached

[1] Mbh. §553 (Vaivāh.^{c}): IV, 70-72, 2267 ff.

[2] Cf. the many indications in Mbh. IV, 35-37; e.g., Kṛṣṇā's hint to Uttara: "Arjuna will doubtless obey your sister of graceful hips"; voluptuous description of Uttarā's approaching Arjuna in the dancing-hall, and making her request to her 'sakhā', displaying 'praṇaya' and coquetry, 'like a she-elephant seeking her mate', vowing suicide if he did not keep her request, etc.

[3] Vide n. 2, above. She is among the circle of court-ladies attending on the gay, spoilt and musical prince Uttara. Her developed youth is described; and she bears a son about six months after her marriage a few days later. Playing with dolls, is still a common pastime with grown-up girls in many social circles in India, often continuing far into their married life: so also the post-Mauryan 'Nāgaraka' (in Vāts. Kā. Sūt.) captivates his lady-love as much by presents of dolls as by taking her to clubs dances and theatricals. This in itself, therefore, is no reason for concluding child-marriage in Uttarā's case, as the Cambridge Hist. of Ind. does.

[4] Cf. the parallels of Pratipa, Bhāgīrathī and Śantanu; and Jyāmagha, his captive maiden and Vidarbha; vide infra.

[5] Such explanation is not seriously attempted by the Pūrāṇas; the Brāhmaṇas do it, and that because the Ṛgvedic reference itself is a mythological version of a Purāṇic tradition. (It would seem as if the Ailas generally mythologised the traditions of the pre-existing peoples, viz., the Mānvas and Pṛthuites.)

its highest point,[1] when these cases are indicated, and the last phases of the Epic age were being worked out. Thus such connexions between parent and offspring, or persons in equivalent position, cannot have been due to the needs of a strongly patriarchal, primitive and conquering community; they were rather the extreme result of two well-known forces that have worked amongst various early[2] but civilized peoples: the tendency in long-established hereditary priesthoods and ruling families to continued in-breeding, and to unlimited license. As a matter of fact the close of the Vedic age, which is the same as the Epic age, shows evident signs of increasing social degeneracy in many other respects, which clearly continued till the time of the Upaniṣads and the development of the great Reformation in the Prācī.[3] This general outline will emerge again and again in view as we proceed to examine the evidence in regard to other social details.

With regard to the nature of the sister-marriages also, the Vedic evidence by itself suggests no very adequate explanation[4] of the references to them; and here, again, the ' traditional ' evidence is somewhat helpful. An examination[5] of the Vedic uses and imports of words designating brother and sister, and of their comparative position in the Vedic (Brāhmaṇical) family, as indicated by incidental references, yields rather uncertain results: these uses and indications only make it possible that sister-marriage may have developed in a community and age, which was either strongly patriarchal and emphasised the brother as master and supporter, or which, being originally matriarchal, still retained traces of the importance of the sister in the family and descent through the mother.[6]

---

[1] Between Māndhātṛ and Sudās roughly, about 20 steps before the ' Bhārata ' period.

[2] Thus Artaxerxes Mnemon (early 4th cent. B.C.) married his daughter Atossa: Sykes: Hist. Pers. I. 246 Medieval and modern history is left out of account here. (This tendency is found also in small communities with a hereditary occupation: thus more or less consanguinous marriages are not infrequent amongst certain modern trading castes in Bengal.).

[3] The check, however, seems to have been only temporary; for post-Mauryan morality (cf. Vāts. Kā. Sūt., *re* dynastic and priestly customs) is quite as bad as pre-Buddhistic; indeed, the evidence of the Arthaśāstra would seem to show that within non-Buddhistic spheres of influence there was little change in tone even in the early Maurya period; probably the only puritanistic age for the whole country was that of Aśoka, and that of the growth of early Buddhism from before his time, in limited areas.

[4] Except that the sister (and specially the twin-sister) was supposed in early times to be the brother's wife by birth-right (Rv. X, 10, and Av. XIV, 2, 33), and that such connexions were sanctioned in case of necessity for a son and heir (Rv. X, 10, and the ' gāthā ' in the Śunaḥśepa legend): both of which indications point to a patriarchal origin.

[5] Vide ante.

[6] Vide ante

The independent value of such linguistic evidence in history is rather doubtful. The Purāṇic evidence makes the ground somewhat clearer: while there are two probable cases of one sister marrying two brothers,[1] there are definite as well as probable cases of a brother marrying two, three, or more sisters[2]; and in other instances the sister is only one of several wives.[3] Hence the noticed sister-marriages in the Purāṇa-Vedic period were rather more patriarchal in features than matriarchal, being more definitely connected with polygamy than with polyandry. On the other hand, some of the early instances show that the chief part in such unions was played by the sister[4]; and the two apparently polyandrous cases were also comparatively early.[5] Hence the matriarchal type of sister-marriage was the earlier one. It looks like having an ethnic significance. But the references in view belong to all the three broad groups of the Pṛthuites, Mānvas and Ailas, though chiefly to the non-Ailas.[6] Indeed, the selection of the Mānva case of Yama and his sister as typical in Ṛv. X, 10, would indicate that so late as the date of that 'vākovākya,' the sister usually took the initiative in such connexions; though on the other hand the earlier Ṛv. VI, 55 would suggest that it was the brother who took it; and one of Yamī's motives is to have the full extent of a brother's rightful 'protection' and bear a worthy grandson for their father (i.e., a pure-blooded one),—a patriarchal trait.[7]

Thus the Vedic sister-marriage must have originated in two distinct pre-historic types of civilizations, which blended their features in one,—probably to be indentified with the Aila and the pre-(and non-)Aila.

---

[1] At the same time, or (apparently) in succession: with Haimavatī-Dṛṣadvatī and Narmadā, respectively, both in the Aikṣvāka line; cf. similar indication in Sītā's case (vide ante), also in the same family.

[2] Bharata (Āṅgirasa): 3; Bhajamāna and Satrājit (Yādavas): 2 and 10.

[3] E.g., with Daśaratha (Aikṣvāka), or Drupada (Pāñcāla), or with Śukra-Uśanas.

[4] E.g., Sunīthā, Yamī, Acchodā, Narmadā: vide ante.

[5] About 70-74 steps before the Bhārata battle.

[6] The instance of Acchodā alone being an Aila one; Sunīthā is Pṛthuite; Yamī and Narmadā, Mānva,—to which may be added Haimavatī-Dṛṣadvatī, for Prasenajit is known as *her* son (vide ante).

[7] This is also the motive in the earlier Aṅga-Sunīthā case.

III

POLYANDRY

The Vedic evidence[1] suggests that polyandry was not altogether 'un-Vedic'; it was apparently known, though particular instances are not named, which silence has at best only a negative value, for full details of these matters cannot be expected from the nature of the Vedic literature. The Epic tradition definitely assigns polyandry to the close of the Vedic age; and very much earlier, even pre-Vedic[2] instances are known to Purāṇic and Epic tradition. The number of illustrations of peculiar customs is naturally not large, specially as later editors were busy in removing striking traces of primitive characteristics that had become offensive. A remarkable case of such removal is that of the polyandric marriage of a brāhmaṇ lady, Gautamī: the Epic affirms that in the time of the Pāṇḍavas one authoritative precedent of polyandry was that of Gautamī, who married seven 'ṛṣis,' and that the case is recorded in the Purāṇas[3]; but the Purāṇa texts, in their royal or priestly genealogies, have no such mention now: obviously the instance has been removed in brāhmaṇic interest.[4] In the cases of sister-marriages and incestuous connexions, it has already been shown how texts have been emended, muddled, misinterpreted and mythified, wherever prominent examples of these were noticed; in the case of polyandry, as well, the explicit instances that have escaped weeding out and emendation are few, but it is still possible to see that many more were known at one time.

Before proceeding to examine these probabilities, and the the famous epic instance, which was too well known and late to be successfully buried,[5] the two explicit references may be noted here. The ten grandsons (or great-grandsons) of the famous Pṛthu-Vainya married a common wife Mārīṣā,[6]

---

[1] Vide ante.

[2] I.e., Pṛthu-ite, being several steps above the earliest group of Mānva ṛṣis in the Ṛgveda; Pṛthu-Vainya is, however, also included within the Vedic anthology; and the case referred to is assigned to three steps below Pṛthu.

[3] Mbh. § 237 (Vaivāhika.°): I, 196, 7265.

[4] While the non-brāhmaṇic case of Mārīṣā m. 10 Havirdhānas (or Pracetasas) referred to in the Epic in the same connection (Mbh. I, 196, 7266) is found in all Purāṇas.

[5] Even here, cf. the explanation in the Mārkaṇḍeya, that it was really a 'monandry', since the five Pāṇḍavas were parts of the same Indra.

[6] Viṣṇu: I, 15. states that Mārīṣā in a former birth became a childless young widow, and obtained a divine boon for several husbands at the same time to ensure non-widowhood and progeny.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

a daughter of Soma.[1] The Purāṇic account further specifies that this happened, because in the Cākṣuṣa-'Manu's' period[2] the population or dynastic birth-rate declined, and those ten princes, the Havirdhānas (also known by the common appellation Prācetasas),[3] were admonished by Soma to procreate, who gave them his daughter Mārīṣā as their common wife; 'they' had by her Dakṣa, the 'prajāpati,' who was very prolific,[4] and other children also,[5] but no 'fathers' are specified in any case: Dakṣa-Prācetasa in fact is often said to have had ten 'fathers.'[6] The other explicit mention is about the brāhmaṇ lady, Jaṭilā-Gautamī and her seven 'ṛṣi' husbands.[7] Her example must have been well known and appreciated at one time, for in Mbh. (besides Pāṇḍu's reference) the wives of citizens admire Draupadī in the company of her five husbands and compare her to Gautamī with her 'ṛṣi' husbands.[8] The chronological position of this case is not so evident, but the outside limits can be fixed: she cannot be placed before the Gautamas are first mentioned[9] in Bharata's or Marutta's time, or later than the Pāṇḍavas, to whom she is a precedent; and there are some indications in favour of the earlier limit.[10]

Taking the less definite cases, inferable or probable, in chronological order, we come first to the already noticed combined polyandry and brother-marriage of Haimavatī-Dṛṣadvatī, in the 18th step[11] from Manu and in the Aikṣvāka line; and only four steps lower, to the almost parallel case of Narmadā (m. Purukutsa and Ambarīṣa), where the somewhat meaningless 'sambhūta' of the texts (instead of being a proper name) may be a relic and a corruption of 'sambhūya,' 'san-matāt,' or 'sammatā,'[1] referring to Narmadā's being wife of Purukutsa and brothers in common.

---

[1] As her son's daughters were also married to a 'Soma' (in all accounts of the pre-Ailas), it would seem that 'Soma' was a clan name even before it was used to designate the Aila dynasties derived from 'Soma'; cf. the curious question on this point in Viṣṇu: I, 15, 80-81.

[2] I.e., the interval between the 6th and 15th steps in the Pṛthuite dynasty, and between the 3rd and 12th steps before the Vaivasvata-'Manu'.

[3] Matsya: 4 (Svāyambhuva genealogy).

[4] Harivaṃśa: 2, 88-106; Mbh. § 137 (Sambhava.°) I, 75, 3130.

[5] Matsya: ibid.; viz., Nandī, Candravatī, etc.

[6] Mbh. I, 33; 3130; 75; etc.; cf. Hariv.° V, 66 ff., and Mbh. § 665 (Mokṣa.°): XII, 208, 7573.

[7] Vide n. 3, p. 145.

[8] 'Maharṣiṇ iva Gautami': Mbh. § 635 (Rājadh.°): XII. 38, 1397.

[9] Utathya-Āṅgirasa being regarded in the 'ṛṣi' genealogies as the first Gautama,—or Dīrghatamas, his son, according to other versions (cf. Pargiter: AIHT. pp. 219-220).

[10] Vide infra.

[11] About five steps above this, in the time of Kuvalāśva-Aikṣvāka, the contemporary Paurava Sudhanvan-Dhundhu (made into an Asura adversary) is said to have been son of two brothers. Madhu and Kaiṭabha (Mbh. § 475 Dhundhu.°): III, 202, 13532; 204, 13587); this looks like legend; but it seems likely that 'Manasyvabhayayoḥ putram' of some dynastic śloka has been made into 'Madhukaiṭabhayoḥ putram', to remove odium from the Paurava dynasty: Manasyu and Abhaya were the immediate predecessors of Dhundhu. If this view may be taken, we have

About 19 steps later on, there is the much clearer case of Mamatā, amongst the first Gautamas (a section of the Āṅgirasas); and Jaṭilā-Gautamī's polyandric marriage (cited by the Pāṇḍavas) must have been due to a tradition of such marriages in this family. Mamatā[2] is said to have been Utathya's wife, but his brother Vṛhaspati had free access to and equal conjugal rights over her in Utathya's life-time; the only objection Mamatā once raises to their exercise is her pregnancy at that time; she asks him to wait, but does not refer to any impropriety or unlawfulness of conduct; evidently she was in the status of a wife to both brothers.[3] So also Vṛhaspati and Mamatā's son Bharadvāja is said to have got that name from the circumstance of his being 'born of two fathers,' who both charged the mother Mamatā with his maintenance; the derivation may be an ingenious after-thought, but the fact referred to is original. This Bharadvāja is also called 'dvāmuṣyāyaṇa,' which is usually explained as referring to his adoption by Bharata, so that being the son of a priest by birth, and of a king by adoption, he would be the son of 'two fathers.' But the details of that famous tradition[4] of Bharata's adoption show that it was not Bharadvāja himself who was adopted, but his son or descendant Vitatha (or Vidathin), who seems to

---

a parallel instance in the Paurava line as well. The probability increases when we find a Saṃyāti section among the Kāśyapa brāhmaṇs (Matsya : 199), who counted a number of 'dvāmuṣyāyaṇa' or biandric families amongst them (vide infra.); and Saṃyāti was a near successor of Dhundhu. (It was, of course, common for princes to found ṛṣi or brāhmaṇ families affiliated to different gotras).

[1] Vide collated text, ante.; cf. the epithet 'sammatā bhāryā' of the Pāṇḍavas, given to Draupadī, and 'satām matāt' in the case of Haimavatī.

[2] For these details *re* Gautama family (connected with Bharata and Vali in tradition), cf. Matsya : 49, 11-34; Viṣṇu : IV, 19, 5-8; Matsya : 48, 32-57; Vāyu : 99; Brahmāṇḍa : III, 74; Mbh. § 170 (Dīrgh.°) : I, 104.

[3] It is noteworthy that Tārā, the wife of a much earlier Vṛhaspati, also stated to have been an Āṅgirasa, was desired by his brother Dharma, who however did not get her, being obstructed by her paramour Soma (Varāha : XXXII). Though rather semi-legendary. the tradition certainly is of value as showing trace of polyandry among Āṅgirasas (to whom other primitive forms of connexions are also ascribed).

[4] For these and other connected details dealt with here, cf. Brahma : 13, 58-60; Matsya : 49, 11-34; Viṣṇu : IV, 19, 4-8; Vāyu 99; Hariv. 32, 1726-'31.

have been really a kṣetraja son of Bharata through Sunandā[1]; probably it was no case of adoption at all: ' saṃkrāmaṇa ',—transmission, grafting or infusion,—may equally refer to a ' niyoga '[2]. So Bharadvāja was a ' dvāmuṣyāyaṇa ' in some other way,—evidently because he was ' born of two fathers,' Utathya and Vṛhaspati, whose joint wife Mamatā was, in the same way as Dakṣa was, ' son of ten fathers.' Thus we find, besides descendants of Bharadvāja, three other Āṅgirasa and eight (or twelve) Kāśyapa families[3] designated 'dvāmuṣyāyaṇas '; all of their forefathers cannot have been similarly adopted by childless kings, and they have no evident connexions with any dynasty; but these brāhmaṇ clans may well have had some sort of a biandric custom[4] originally. It is noteworthy that in the next generation also, the same features are repeated to some extent.[5] Thus Dīrghatamas freely approaches his younger brother's wife[6]; and like Mamatā, Dīrghatamas's wife Pradveṣī maintains her children, even the husband; and his ruling on her (and on all women thenceforwards, it is said) restricting her to one husband, shows that she too (probably like other Āṅgirasa women) followed Mamatā,[7] as Dīrghatamas followed Vṛhaspati.

---

[1] Mbh. states that as a result of Bharadvāja's good offices, Sunandā, the queen of Bharata, bore Bhūmanyu, after the nine sons had perished: Mbh. § 151 (Puruvaṃ°.): I, 94, 3710 ff.
(*N.B.*—From a consideration of all the traditions about Duṣyanta, Marutta, Bharata and the Gotama-Āṅgirasas, it is clear that the ' saṃkrāmaṇa ' of Bharadvāja was due to the influence of Marutta's family; Marutta's daughter Saṃyatā was given to his Āṅgirasa priest Saṃvarta, brother of Utathya; it is possible that the interest of the Marutta-ites in this adoption was due to Bharadvāja's being born of this princess, who may well have been the common wife of all three brothers, and the same as Mamatā.)

[2] Vide infra, sec. *re* ' niyoga '.

[3] Hūta, Śamīga and Śaiśira,—Āṅgirasas (Matsya: 196, 52); for Kāśyapas,—Matsya: 199, 11-12 (Śaiśira being common).

[4] As amongst the Mānvas and other non-Aila peoples; vide infra. (Kāśyapas are probably=Mānvas; the name Kāśyapa itself may be of Dravidian origin; so also the name Āṅgirasa).

[5] Cf. n. 2, p. 147.

[6] Though he is cast out apparently for thus transgressing the limits of an ' elder ' brother, the main objection against him was his passing the limits of decency in *other* ways, and it was more his wife than his brother who banished him. At most we have here probably an intermediate stage in the development of polyandry,—the wife of the ' elder ' brother only being common to the younger brothers, but not vice versa (as also in the case of ' niyoga ' and widow-remarriage, where the rights of the elder brother were restricted subsequently). Cf. one of the objections raised by Dhṛṣtadyumna against Yudhiṣṭhira's marrying Dranpadī, who, having been won by Arjuna, was virtually an younger brother's wife.

[7] Mamatā and Pradveṣī's economic position in the Gautama family is evidently a trace of a passing matriarchal custom; cf. the metronymic Māmateya; cf. also the mother as ' bhartri ' in Ved. lit. (vide ante).

Polyandric traits crop up again in tradition about 20 steps further down, and all in the same connexion. It is noteworthy that these refer mainly to the Deccān peoples connected with the Mānvas. The 'Rāmāyaṇic' tradition (common to both the epics and the Purāṇas) affirms this feature of Kiṣkindhā,[1] where Vālī and Sugrīva are born of the same mother Virajā, wife of Ṛkṣa, by two co-existent paramours[2](?), and they, in turn, practically had either the wife Tārā, or the wives Tārā and Rumā, in common, though they quarrelled about it and excluded one another alternately.[3] Further south the relationship between Mandodarī and 'Rāvaṇa' and Vibhīṣaṇa[4] indicates a similar polyandric trait, over and above 'devṛ'-marriage. It is quite possible that in 'Śūrpanakhā' attending on her brothers[5] during their early austerities, it is a case of combined polyandry and sister-marriage: for the only other 'traditional' instances where austerities are assisted by an attendant woman are those of Agastya and Lopāmudrā[6] and (the legendary) Śiva and Umā,[7] in both of which the woman is the wife. It is also significant that it is only the 'Rākṣasa' chiefs of the S.E., who hunt or roam about accompanied by a sister, who often acts independently, and excites the resentment of and endangers her brothers, by her sudden and misplaced loves.[1] The fraternal polyandry of Sunda and Upasunda also seems to belong to the generation before Rāma, and to the N.E. part of the Deccān.[2] The Mbh. illustrates[3] the danger of polyandry by the famous story[4] of these two chiefs of the Vindhyan uplands quarrelling over the same woman; and even before Tilottamā's appearance, the two brothers seem to have had other women in common, but without any resultant troubles. Considering all this 'Rāmāyaṇic' evidence, and the already noticed polyandric (and biandric) traces amongst the Aikṣvākas (Mānvas) and connected groups like the Āṅgirasas, etc.,[5] it seems not unlikely[6] that, in the original tradition, Sītā was the common wife of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, just as it is clear that she was originally the sister-wife of Rāma[1]; indeed, the episode of Lakṣmaṇa refusing to go to assist Rāma while his cries of distress are heard, and Sītā charging him (*and* Bharata) with a design of appropriating herself after getting rid of Rāma,[2] seems to point to this original relationship, which would then be paralleled[3] by the case of Tārā and her husbands at strife, amongst a people friendly and probably kindred to the Mānvas.[4]

---

[1] Probably it is needless to say now that the Vānaras and Rākṣasas represent real races, perhaps in some way connected with later Dravidians and Kolārians, with occasional Āryan admixtures.

[2] E.g., Brahmāṇḍa: III, 7, 212-16; etc.; cf. Mbh. III, 147, 11193 f.; Rām. VII, 42.

[3] E.g., Padma: IV, 112 (Pur.° Rām.°): 146-163 (Brahmāṇḍa III, 7, 218-21 names Tārā and Rumā, but omits the fraternal strifes); cf. Rām. IV (Kiṣk.°): Tārāvākyam, or secs. 5 to 35 generally, and sec. 46.

[4] Cf. 'Tārā Mandodarī tathā' in the traditional couplet about famous polyandrous women of history. With Mandodarī it was apparently also a case of brother-sister or cousin marriage; for she describes herself (Rām. VI. 113) as a daughter's daughter of Sumālī, who was also the maternal grandfather of Rāvaṇa; Mandodarī's mother, the light-skirt Hemā (who had a disastrous amour with M.°'s father) was thus either the same as Rāv.°'s rather forward mother Nikaṣā (Kaikasī), or her sister.

[5] Twin as well as step: Mbh. III, 275. For the possibility, cf. Rām. III, 21, where Śūrpanakhā calls Khara her 'nātha,' and he too speaks of himself as her 'nātha.' It is to be noted that Śūrp.° concealed her love for Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa from her 'nātha' and Rāvaṇa, and invented reasons for her plight. Śūrp.° is said to have first been married to the Kālakeya Vidyujjihva, but Rāv.° killed him in battle, and then made her over to his brother or cousin Khara, with whom she continued to live, obeyed by him (Rām. VII, 29). To Rāma she said: "Passing over (ati-krāntā) my brothers Rāvaṇa, Kumbhakarṇa and Vibhīṣaṇa, and the two brothers Khara and Dūṣaṇa, I am approaching thee as husband, falling in love with thee at first sight,—so be thou my husband for long" (Rām. III, 17).

[6] Padma: V, 22, 40-1; cf. Mbh. III, 97, 8579-80.

[7] In the later secs. of Pur.° and in the Kāvyas: Matsya: 154-158 (the germ of 'Kumāra'); Varāha: XXI-XXII; etc.

---

[1] Cf. the stories of 'Śūrpanakhā and her brothers 'Rāvaṇa,' etc., and Khara, etc., and 'Hiḍimbā' and her brothers (Hiḍimba and Vaka, etc.), in different sources and periods. I agree with Pargiter in thinking that 'Śūrpanakhā' and 'Hiḍimbā' are Sanskritised forms of the original Dravidian and sensible epithets of 'Surupnagai' (ruling or crown princess) and 'Iḍimbā' (proud woman or empress); so also 'Rāvaṇa' = 'Iraivan' (lord, king), and 'Hanumant' = 'Āṇmaṇḍi' (male monkey = 'Vṛṣā-Kapi'), a patron deity of the Dravidian Vānaras, or perhaps even of Kośalas; elsewhere I have suggested that brāhmaṇ gotra names like Āṅgirasa or Kāśyapa may be Sanskritised forms of Dravidian clan names (meaning 'magician' and 'mat-seated father,' respectively).

[2] In Rām.° Mārīca is son of Tāḍakā (a non-Āryan chieftainess of Malaya and Kāruṣa) by Sunda (a descendant of Dhundhu), who shortly came by his end; and though not a pure Rākṣasa by birth he came to be regarded as such. In the Pur.°*, of the two brothers Sunda and Upa(Ni)sunda (vaguely derived from Diti's race), Sunda's son by Tāḍakā was Mārīca, while one reading seems to have implied that he was 'born of Tāḍakā from Sunda *and* Upa(Ni)sunda† (with which may be compared Dhundhu, son of 'Madhu' *and* 'Kaiṭabha,' ante). The geographical setting of SundOpasunda's story in Mbh. agrees with that of Mārīca and his parents in Rām.°, being the same Vindhyan forests and tablelands bordering on the Gangetic valley. According to Mbh., Sunda and Upasunda raided the whole country from their Vindhyan home (cf. similar devastation attributed to Sunda's family in Rām.°) and reached Kurukṣetra, which is quite probable, as at this step in the dynastic lists the Kuru kingdom was in abeyance owing to Pāñcāla raids (cf. the circumstances of the Rākṣasa occupation of Vārāṇasī); hence the story of Sunda and Upasunda's destruction through a biandric practice must have been well known in the Kuru country, and the allusion to it in Pāṇḍava court is therefore genuine.

* E.g. Brahmāṇḍa : III, 5, 34 ff; Vāyu : 67, 72-3.

† Thus 'Nisunda' is an alternative for 'putrastu,'—Vāyu : op. cit.; prob. in Brahmāṇḍa op. cit. the true reading might be 'Mārīco SaundOpasundas Tāḍakāyām ajāyata' instead of '. . . Sunda-putrastu. . . '.

[3] Vide latter part of last note.

[4] Mbh. § 246 (Rājyalā.° : Sundop.°) : I, 209-212.

[5] Vide ante.

[6] These probabilities need not upset admirers of the epics, for the actual events of the Rām.° occurred at least 1,300 years before their Kāvya idealization (which process indeed has continued through the middle ages to the present day),—and the ideals of subsequent ages of course do not suffer.

For about 25 steps after this, tradition supplies no trace of polyandry (or biandry). Then, again, indications become evident during the several generations before the Bhārata battle. It would almost seem as if these apparent recrudescences are due only to the variation of the tradition in fulness of detail, and are not real reappearances.[5]

In connection with the Pāṇḍava proposal of polyandry[6], indeed, Drupada is said to have been shocked at its novelty; but Dhṛṣṭadyumna gives the whole show away by arguing that *Yudhiṣṭhira* as *elder* brother of Arjuna could not marry the girl won by the latter, thus showing that a restricted polyandry *was* known to the Pāñcāla court[7]; and Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyaṇa further spoils the case by explaining how the practice was established and is to be recognized,—and one of his two explanations, shorn of fable, plainly indicates that even in the next previous generation polyandry could occur in a good 'ṛṣi' family[1] (while the other explanation seems to refer to a dynastic case).[2] Above all,[3] even before the 'svayaṃvara' of Draupadī, Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyaṇa takes the polyandry for granted as an ordinary thing supported by 'ṛṣi' precedent, and advises the Pāṇḍavas accordingly, twice[4]; and Kuntī is remarkably insistent in her demands all along,—all that explanation by her 'dread of untruthfulness' being evidently silly.[5]

---

[1] Vide ante.

[2] Rām. III, 45 and 49. This original relationship seems to be confirmed further by Rāma's suggestion that Sītā might live as wife with Lakṣmaṇa, Bharata and Śatrughna (Rām. VI, 117), and by Virādha's surmise that Sītā was the common wife of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa (Rām. III, 2). Rāma had proposed Sītā's transference to Bharata even before her abduction, on the eve of his exile as a convenient arrangement during his absence (Rām. II, 30, 8-9, with 26, latter part).

[3] Cf. also the case of Nala, Puṣkara and Damayantī in Upper Deccān, a few steps above; also that of Mandodarī (virtually a Mānva case, for Rāvaṇa's line was traced from that of Vaiśālī); cf. Vālī and Rāvaṇa vowing to have wives in common (like Sugrīva) as a token of friendship: Rām. VII, 39.

[4] The Mānva families of Ayodhyā, Vaiśālī, etc., and the brāhmaṇ families of Āṅgirasas, Kāśyapas, Vāśiṣṭhas, etc., were apparently originally Dravidian (at any rate extra-Āryan traits are found largely amongst them, though the Ailas are not altogether free from them). The comparatively later and wrong legend of Mitrā-Varuṇa and Urvaśī seems to indicate an original custom of biandry amongst the Vāśiṣṭhas, as amongst Āṅgirasas and Kāśyapas, like whom they also might be called 'dvāmuṣyāyaṇas.'

[5] So also with regard to the reappearance of other forms like sister-marriage, etc.

[6] Mbh. § 237 (Vaivāh.°): I, 195, 7226 ff.; 7255-7263. Vyāsa's explns.: § 238-'9 (Pañcendrop.°): I, 197, 7316 ff.

[7] So also Vidura is said to have advised *householders* of Indraprastha and Arjuna's successor there to desist from polyandrous marriages: Cowell: Jāt. VI, 139, etc.; vide infra, pp. 161—162 for Jātaka version of the Pāṇḍava polyandry (on Kṛṣṇā's *own* initiative).

This last point, and the fact that, whether by way of 'niyoga' or by way of polyandry,[6] Kuntī had herself known several 'husbands,' make it likely that polyandry[1] was then also known amongst the Yādava races.[2] The uniform statement in the Purāṇas that 'Āhukī' (three steps above Kṛṣṇa) 'was given in marriage to the Avantis (or Avanti princes)',[3] also Yādavas, may refer to this lingering practice; the form of the statement is too unusual in the genealogies to admit of any other meaning. In the Epic and Purāṇas the Avantis have two co-kings,[4] in the third step after Āhukī; Vidarbha, another Yādava state, was in the same period ruled by joint kings, apparently representing two sections of the same dynasty, the Krātha and the Kaiśika[5]; Magadha in the same period had a succession of dual kings[6]; so also in Kiṣkindhā, where 'Mainda' and 'Dvivida' ruled the kingdom of Vālī and Sugrīva.[7] If these instances of 'diarchy,' in the same age and in a continuous belt of country (the Deccān and its borderlands), were not purely accidental, they may have easily led to a dynastic custom of having a common 'mahiṣī' by way of 'biandry.'[8] Apart from this possibility there is surer indication that tradition knew of kings of different dynasties sharing the favours of a princess[1] by agreement: the apparently wild tales of Yayāti's daughter '[2] and the ' five Indras '[3] prove this.

---

[1] The polyandric tendency, often amounting to unrestricted license, lingered on amongst the brāhmaṇ families, even after the Bhārata battle, specially among the Āṅgirasas, Kāśyapas and Ātreyas: vide infra.

[2] Vide infra.

[3] For other indications of frequency of polyandry, vide infra. The very fact that Draupadī was able to conceal her identity by professing to be the common wife of five 'gandharvas' (whatever may be the real meaning of that term,—'Kinnaras' = Upper Sutlej hillmen, or simply professional musicians or Kuśīlavas, whose wives, according to Vāts. Kā. Sūt., are not confined to one husband), shows that polyandry was fairly well known in the Matsya country as well. (Probably even 'gandharva' is an afterthought, and the Pāṇḍavas in their incognito exile simply passed themselves off as another humbler polyandrous family; vide n. 7, p. 151). Drau.° is taken to be a gandharvī w. of the sons of a gandh.° king (Mbh. IV, 9, 257). She professes to be w. of five gandh.° (IV, 9, 273 ff.; 14, 426; 16, 493; 21, 664; 22, 787), So also the Pāṇḍ.° are mistaken for gandh.° (Bhī.°: IV, 8, 235; 22, 792; 23, 819; 71, 2293; Nak.°: 12, 323; Arj.°: 45, 1406). Note that it was a 'gandharva' who advised the Pāṇḍ° to contract a polyandrons marriage with a Kāśyapa priest's help, and that gandharvas were Kinnaras (Mbh. II, 10, 396: etc.; vide Sör. Index, s.v. gandh.° and Kinn.°), among whom Pāṇḍu lived and allowed Kuntī's and Mādrī's five connexions, and whose modern representatives the Kanwaris are still polyandrous.

[4] Mbh. § 220 (Caitraratha°): I, 168; 169, Dhaumya was chosen (at the instance of a Gandharva chief) the Pāṇḍava family priest in view of their intended polyandrous marriage, and he performed their nuptial rites according to a form whereby the common bride was deemed to have regained virginity after each individual marriage and its consummation; he also performed the usual ceremonies for the children of this marriage; his kinsmen were also the royal chaplains of the Pāñcālas (Mbh. I, 183; 193, 7338; 221, 8047; etc.). Thus the Gautama (Āṅgirasa), Vāśiṣṭha and Kāśyapa brāhmaṇs were all familiar with polyandric marriages, as much as the princes and people of Indraprastha, Matsya and Pāñcāla. Cf. the regret of Draupadī that she and her husbands were not born as brāhmaṇs, for amongst Kṣatriyas she had been called a cow by Duryodhana for her polyandry; Mbh. § 340 (Arjunābhig.°): III, 37.

[5] Mbh. I, 196.

[6] Vide infra.

---

[1] Along with other primitive forms.

[2] It was apparently also known amongst the people of Māhiṣmatī and its Paurava princes; the custom of sexual liberty of Māh.° wives who were not confined to one husband was noticed by Sahadeva Pāṇḍava when he conquered that kingdom; it was said to have been sanctioned or established by brāhmaṇ ordinance (Mbh. II, 31, 1124-40); cf. the tradition about Uddālaka; also the w. of an 'Atri' (pro-Yādava and Central Indian) leaving one husband and having issue by another agent: (Mbh. XIII, 14, 684, ff.).

[3] 'Avantibhyaḥ'; one text emends to 'Avantiṣu'; probably 'Avantibhyām' would be a good reading (vide next note):—Brahma: 15, 48; 54; Hariv. 38, 2017; 2023; Matsya: 44, 66-70; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 71, 121; 128; the Vāyu text is corrupt, but obviously its source was in the same form as other texts.

[4] 'VindĀnuvindau': Vāyu: 96, 145 ff. Brahmāṇḍa: III, 71, 150 ff. (confusing with the two Kekayas of same name mentioned in the Epic); Matsya: 46, 3-10; Viṣṇu: IV, 14, 10-11; same in Hariv.; Padma: V, 13, 56.

[5] The brothers 'Krātha' and 'Kaiśika' were the joint rulers of Kuṇḍiṇa City: Hariv. 108, 5980-81;—Bhīṣmaka being the 'Kaiśika' in Kṛṣṇa's time (often in Hariv. 105 to 108) and Ākṛ (hvṛ)ti being the 'Krātha' (ibid., sp. in the lists of kings opposed to Kṛṣṇa in connection with Rukmiṇī's abduction).

[6] In Mbh.: cf. Sör. Index (p. 355) for their names,—chiefly, Jarāsandha and Jalasandha; Jayatsena and Sahadeva; Daṇḍa and Daṇḍadhāra, etc.

[7] Mbh.; in the account of Sahadeva's southern campaign; and Hariv., in that of Kṛṣṇa's exploits. (These two names were probably dynastic ones, as they also occur in connection with Rāma's stories and in Purāṇic 'Vānara' genealogies).

[8] As earlier in the case of Vālī and Surgrīva; cf. Mandodarī.

This former story takes us back to a period[4] before the ' Gautama ' cases of polyandry, quite an early stage; and is told of persons who are otherwise[5] famous in tradition; hence the amount of fable and brāhmaṇical edification that has entered into the account[6] is only what might be expected, specially as the behaviour of those personages was far from creditable.[7] There are some obvious historical mistakes in the story due to subsequent brāhmaṇical handling,[8] but their sources can be discovered[9]; some of the persons named as contemporary are clearly so,[10] while about others there is no direct traditional evidence to the contrary[11]; and the story as a whole is referred to in other connexions and finds support from incidental Vedic, Purāṇic and Epic allusions.[12]

---

[1] A probable case of such sharing (though not peaceful, apparently) is indicated among the Yādava-Pauravas of the S.W., a generation before the Bhārata battle: the King of Kāruṣa (either Vṛddhaśarman or Dantavakra), Śiśupāla of Cedi, and Vasudeva of Dvārāvatī (and Mathurā), are all stated to have had Bhadrā-Vaiśāli (which name can have belonged to only one person) for their wife. (Śiśupāla, however, obtained her by impersonation or force; but regarding Vasudeva and Kāruṣa there are no special statements. This Bhadrā is also stated to have been Śiśupāla's maternal uncle's wife, whom he enjoyed under the disguise of the Kāruṣa king, who was his mother's sister's husband. So Vasudeva and his brother-in-law apparently had equal access to Bhadrā-Vaiśālī. She however subsequently ascended the funeral pyre of Vasudeva). Vide Mbh. § 291 (Śiśupāla.°) : II, 45, 1570 ff; § 793 (Mauṣala.°) : XVI, 7, 194; cf. Brahmāṇḍa : III, 71, 173-4, and corresponding passages in other Pur.°

[2] Mbh. § 565 (Gālava.°) : V, 114-120.

[3] Mbh. § 238 (Vaivāhika.°) : I, 197.

[4] Before the 40th step and after the 20th step from Manu (which latter is the date of the beginning of Haihaya raids).

[5] Specially in connection with the Haihaya invasions.

[6] So also in *other* stories told about Śivi, Pratardana, Viśvāmitra; or about Sagara, the Bhṛgus, etc.

[7] So also the Pāṇḍava polyandry is cloaked with ill-fitting puerile tales.

[8] E.g. in making Gālava the central figure of the story, or Yayāti a contemporary of the four kings.

[9] Thus Yayāti may easily have been substituted for Ahaṃyāti or Saṃyāti, who were contemporary Yāyātya kings at Pratiṣṭhāna.

[10] E.g. Viśvāmitra and Saṃyāti (through Kṛtavīrya); Uśinara and Haryaśva.

[11] E.g. *re* Uśinara, Divodāsa, Haryaśva and Viśvāmitra.

[12] E.g. Mbh. III, 197, 13301-2; I, 88-93; V, 119-122. Matsya: 35, 5; 37-42. Rv. X, 179; III, 31, 1-3 (by a Viśvāmitra or Kuśika ṛṣi) seems to refer to and justify Haryaśva's begetting a famous son for the benefit of his father-in-law, apparently by a similar arrangement. In Pur.° genealogies the wives of all these four kings (and the mothers of their heirs) are called Dṛṣadvatī.

The substance of the tradition, apart from details and variations, mistakes and embellishments, may be put thus: A king of Yayātis' race, ruling at Pratiṣṭhāna (and prob. = Ahamyāti or Saṃyāti Paurava, i.e., Yāyātya), had a daughter Mādhavī, also called Dṛṣadvatī, who, by some agreement of obscure motive and origin,[1] was jointly queen to four contemporary and neighbouring kings[2] (viz., Haryaśva of Ayodhyā, Divodāsa of Vārāṇasī, Uśīnara of the N.W., and Viśvāmitra of Kānyakubja), and who edified, and bore famous sons (namely, Vasumanas, Pratardana, Śivi and Aṣṭaka) to four different families (viz., Aikṣvāka, Kāśi-Aila, Ānava-Aila and Kauśika-Aila),—and at the same time secured for her father's race the 'merit of perpetuation' through daughter's sons.[3] Later on she held a 'svayaṃvara' afresh,[4] and finally went into exile with her last choice King Haryaśva (ousted from his kingdom),[5] who was also the first; and their subsequent progeny became merged in the Yādava groups.[6] Mādhavī is also

[1] The story is told at Dhṛtarāṣṭra's court to illustrate to the princes the evils of persisting in one's whim recklessly and of too much insistence on any one object; apparently it is Gālava's insistence on paying his guru's fee that is illustrated: but this clearly belongs to the subsequent brāhmaṇical setting of the story; originally the insistence exemplified before a Paurava court must have referred to an ancient Paurava court episode rather than a brāhmaṇ teacher's fee; and the kernel of the story is in fact such an episode. The point of the illustrative story seems to be that by insisting on a dowry or bride-price of 800 horses of rare breed for his daughter,* the Paurava king of Pratiṣṭhāna had to give her as common wife to four suitors,† and even then, the arrangement proving unsatisfactory, he had to offer her in 'svayaṃvara' again.

* Prob. following the famous example of Gādhi of Kānyakubja in the preceding generation; cf. Av., V, 17, 11—15, where horses of precisely the same breed are a prized possession of kings, valued equally with a beloved 'rich-dowried' queen.

† Who had other reasons also for a close combination, viz., the common danger from the Haihayas (at this time allied, by marriage, with the Pratiṣṭhāna court).

[2] For a Jātaka parallel, vide infra.

[3] It is to be noted here that the Prācinvant-Ahaṃyāti section of the Yāyātya-Paurava dynasty evidently became extinct at this point, probably as much through failure of male line as through Haihaya expansion. Raudrāśva-Ṛceyu-Matināra introduce a fresh Paurava branch. Thus the story about the 'fall' of Yayāti and his 'salvation' through the fame of his daughter's sons had a historical foundation.

[4] Probably because the first arrangement could not work well for long.

[5] His expulsion may well have been due to the other three kings.

[6] The Śūrasena section of the Yādavas (desc. from Kṛtavirya, conn. with Ahaṃyāti by marriage, and thus with Mādhavī and Haryaśva) had just risen in the period contemplated by this episode; obviously the Hariv. version has confused a real tradition *re* the affiliation of an exiled Aikṣvāka family to the related Śūrasena-Yādavas, by identifying the earlier Śūrasenas with the later race of Madhu,—probably under the influence of the name **Mādhavī.**

said to have obtained a 'boon from a 'ṛṣi' that after every connexion and child-birth she would regain her virginhood without prejudice to the next case, and she accordingly herself suggests that polyandric arrangement; and the four kings also are fully aware of what they and Mādhavī were about, and show every sign of approval and delight; while their sons by her are their heirs by preference.

Such a remarkable tradition regarding famous kṣatriya dynasties and heroes must have been well-known in the days of the Bhārata war, and Vyāsa as a Paurāṇika might be expected to refer to its precedent on the question of a 'sādhāraṇī' wife for the Pāṇḍava princes. He does refer to it; only later mythical and edifying accretions have obscured this reference: the "Pañcendrôpākhyāna" is nothing but a garbled brāhmaṇical account (with an admixture of folk-tale)[1] of this once famous and striking tradition about the Paurava princess Mādhavī-Dṛṣadvatī and her four (or rather five) royal husbands.

It is a noteworthy feature in the Mādhavī-'Pañcendra' accounts that the polyandry described is not a 'fraternal' one: there is some amount of blood relationship between Mādhavī's several husbands no doubt, owing to common Aila descent and dynastic intermarriages,[2] and Mādhavī herself is so related to them; but there is no immediate fraternal relationship between the four kings. So also the several 'Indras' ('Śivi,

---

[1] With this tale of one wife for five 'Indras' may be compared the still lingering folk legend of 1 Indrāṇī for 7 Indras (cf. a communicated note by Grierson in J.R.A.S.). The Purāṇic basis of such legends may be traced to traditions like that of Nahuṣa courting 'Indra's' queen when he too became an 'Indra' (Śalya tells the story to Yudh.° on the eve of the battle: Mbh. V, 11—15.). The tradition of the common queen of these four great kings, some of whom might well be called 'Indras,' may also have been one source of such a legend. It is noteworthy that Viśvāmitra's father was 'Indra' incarnate; and Śivi and Pratardana were famous and powerful enough for the title; so also other Aila and Aikṣvāka princes had actually become 'Indras.' Perhaps the ancient kings who were called or said to have become 'Indras,' only held or usurped the position of High Priest of the tribe or realm, in addition to that of King. Cf. the Devarāj and Dharmarāj (or Dharma) of Bhutan, its High Priest and Chief Judge. So also Epic-Purāṇic tradition knows of 1 Videha and 1 Ikṣvāku king as Devarāj (a), and 1 Vāśiṣṭha with the same designation (vide Pargiter: AIHT. p. 342 for refs.), and Nahuṣa is called 'Devarāj' (and equivalents) about 24 times in Mbh. (V, and XIII); while Vidura and Yudhiṣṭhira were Dharma(rāja)s. (Cf. also the current idiom, 'Indra-pāta' = passing aways of a great social leader). It is thus possible that the Pañcendra and 'Saptendra' legends are echoes of the times when High Priests (royal or otherwise) had often wives in common ("maharṣīṇi va Gautamī"; cf. n. 1, p. 161).

[2] This is quite apparent from the genealogies.

Viśvabhuj, etc.) are unconnected personages, the only community being their suspended 'Indra'-hood or royalty. Another feature is the initiative taken by the common wife. In the one case the brāhmaṇ Gālava plays an ill-fitting and almost uncalled for leading part, and in the other an advance is made by putting Śiva in the same position. But it is quite evident that the ṛṣi and the god are there to silence criticism[1]; the chief share in arranging the polyandric connexions belongs to Mādhavī and "Śrī"[2]; the former herself suggests such connexion and guarantees that no question of her 'virginity' can be raised by the several husbands; the latter allures an 'Indra' into the 'cave' where four others have already been led to complete her quota, and paralyses her victims by her touch. A third feature is an indication that such a polyandric arrangement was incidental to times of great distress, expulsion from 'Indratva' or lordship in one case, and that from their respective kingdoms in the case of the four contemporary kings, owing to the famous Haihaya-Yādava invasions: evidently the connexion was intended to serve as the basis of a combination against the common danger.

The parallels in the Pāṇḍava age are significant. Like Mādhavī, Kuntī is also granted a 'boon' or a 'mantra'[3] by a ṛṣi, whereby she could, without detriment, summon any number of notable persons ('gods') to her presence and bear children to them; and after her first experiment she was granted a further boon (if it was not already included in the first) that she would continue to be a virgin all the same.[2] In connection with Draupadī's five consecutive marriages and consummations it is stated that every time she became a virgin afresh.[3] Satyavatī, 2 steps before Kuntī retained her "maidenhood" even after bearing a son to Parāśara by virtue of a similar 'ṛṣi' boon.[4] Amongst the Yādavas, besides Kuntī, Bhānumatī, daughter of Bhānu a relative of Kṛṣṇa, is given in marriage to Sahadeva-Pāṇḍava like an ordinary maiden, after her rape by Nikumbha, with whom she lived for a pretty long time before her rescue.[5]

1 So also Garuḍa is brought in and dismissed by Gālava to supply him with divine sanction in his transactions,—an improvement *upon* improvement.

2 Śri = Mādhavī, in later mythological equations; this may be one of the starting points of the Śrī and Pañcendra story.

3 This was used by her co-wife Mādrī also: Mbh. I, 124.

4 Mbh. §131 (Kuntī) : I. 67, 2768—'74 : §175 (Karna-sambh.°) : I. 111, 4385 ff; § 189 (Pāṇḍu) : I, 122, 4748; § 190 (Pāṇḍavotp.°) : I, 123, 4760. Cf. § 569 (Bhagavadyāna) : V. 144; XI. 27,—§ 620 (Śrāddha.°); §789 (Putradarś.°) : XV, 29—30; §547 (Karṇa) III, 303—307, etc.

5 This was a 'ṛṣi' view quoted to Janamejaya : Mbh. §240 (Vaivāh.°) : I, 199 (end).

6 Mbh. § 171 (Bhīṣma-Satyav.°) : I, 103; cf. 63.

7 Hv. 149. 8471—8547.

And Kuntī's own sister Śrutadevā, though married to Vṛddhaśarman of Kāruṣa, is stated to have been mother of Ekalavya, famed as Naiṣādi (and son of Hiraṇyadhanu), having been brought up by the Niṣādas near Dvārāvatī[1]: clearly, Śrutadevā had a similar adventure to Kuntī's, and Ekalavya was her 'kānīna' son,—which however was no detraction from her 'maidenhood' or a bar to subsequent marriage. The frequent ascription in stories of restored maidenhood to 'apsaras'es (some of whom were real women)[2] after connexions with ṛṣis or princes, is thus partly a reflex of actual conditions and opinions. This legal fiction of restored or continued maidenhood was evidently invented at a later period to justify undeniable cases of polyandry (and license) in the near past,—or may have been coeval with that institution in its last days. Like Mādhavi, again, Kuntī herself suggests to Pāṇḍu how she might become mother of children by other men[3]; and like her and 'Śrī,' Draupadī captivates all the five brothers by gazing upon each one of them in love, when she is brought to the hut by Arjuna and Bhīma.[4] Subsequently, on the eve of the great battle, Kṛṣṇa, the 'sakhā' of Draupadī had a secret conference with Karṇa, the 'kānīna' son of Kuntī, in which he tried to win him over to the Pāṇḍava side, by promising that the covetable Draupadī will approach him also as wife when the 6th turn came.[5] Such a bait could not have been offered if Kṛṣṇa's 'sakhī' had not taken the initiative in the matter and expressed to him her willingness[6] to extend the scope of her polyandry by co-option. (The Pāṇḍavas it is said came to know the truth about Karṇa after his death[7]; it may or may not be true; but that presents no difficulty, as Pāṇḍu also did not know about the early amours of Kuntī who persuades him that she was for the first

---

[1] Hariv. 35, 1937-8; together with Vāyu: 96, 145 ff. (and corr. portions, i.e., *re* Vasudeva's sisters, of Matsya, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu, etc.); in Brahmāṇḍa: III, 71, 189-'90, Ekalavya, the child brought up by Niṣādas, is ascribed to a nephew of Śrutadevā; apparently her 'kānīna' connection was with this near nephew.

[2] 'Apsaras' status being ascribed to them owing to similarity of the names (like Urvaśī,, Menakā, Ghṛtācī, etc.) which were quite usual; e.g. the wives of Raudrāśva and Purūravas, or Viśvāmitra and Bharadvāja, etc.

[3] She is no doubt first requested to bear children, but the method for this is her own.—Mbh. §189 (Pāṇḍu): I, 122.

[4] Mbh. §236 (Svayaṃvara): I, 192.

[5] After his embassy to Hāstinapura, Kṛṣṇa took Karṇa on his car and spoke to him of their being cousins and about Draupadī, etc. Mbh. § 569 (Bhagavadyāna): V, 140.

[6] The incidents at her 'svayaṃvara' and the 'dyūta' partly explain how this willingness may have arisen.

[7] But Karṇa knew, at least from Bhīṣma, Kṛṣṇa and Kuntī herself; cf. also Mbh. §620 (Śrāddh.°): XI, 27; §621 (Rājadh.°) XII, 6; Yudh. ° had suspected it at the dice-match (from resemblance): XII, 1.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

time going to experiment with the 'license' she had from a "ṛṣi."[1]). The non-fraternal type of polyandry in the Mādhavī and Śrī stories is found also in the case of Jaṭilā-Gautamī, about a dozen steps later, where no relationship between the 7 husbands is suggested, while in the same connection[2] the 10 husbands of Soma's daughter are stated to have been brothers with a common appellation. In Kuntī's case (which is as much one of 'niyoga' as of polyandry),[3] some of the 'husbands' may have been related as half-brothers or cousins, but others were not.[4] In Draupadī's case also, it is not purely 'fraternal,' for Nakula and Sahadeva had no blood relationship with the other 'brothers' at all, and were simply in the 'status' of brothers; the rest were but half-brothers. Mādhavī's being the common wife of four kings did not prevent her sons by them from duly succeeding to their respective fathers' kingdoms (even by preference over other sons, as with Aṣṭaka and Śivi), or those kings from having other individual wives (as with Viśvāmitra and Uśīnara) and other sons by them.[5] So also in Draupadī's case, her sons by some of her husbands are recognized as 'dāyādas' to them individually,[6] and probably this was so in all cases, with the exception of Arjuna's son by Draupadī (being apparently born after Subhadrā's son Abhimanyu)[7]; and the Pāṇḍavas also have other wives individually,[8] though not without some opposition from Draupadī,[9] and other sons by them. Again, just as Mādhavī is free to select a husband in the regular manner, even after her previous connexions,[10] so also Draupadī is asked by Duḥśāsana and Karṇa in the 'sabhā' to select anew a husband from amongst the Kurus[1] (though the occasion for the request is a special circumstance), and later on Jayadratha asks her to leave her five husbands and be his queen[2]; Kīcaka also wanted her: he did not know who she was, but knew that she was a maid-in-waiting with five husbands whose venegeance might fall upon him[3];—the underlying idea apparently was that previous polyandric or irregular connexions (like those mentioned above) were no bar to subsequent regular marriage. The third feature of the Mādhavī-Pañcendra stories is also common to the cases of Kuntī and Draupadī, particularly to the latter. On the continuity of Pāṇḍu's claim to the throne through sons raised by Kuntī (who was a Yādava princess), on the securing of Pāñcāla support and maintenance of fraternal unity amongst these 'Pāṇḍavas,' turns the whole story of the Great Epic.

---

[1] Mbh. §189 (Pāṇḍu): I, 122 (latter part) and 123.

[2] Mbh. I, 196, 7266.

[3] For the 'niyogas' were not confined to one person, and Pāṇḍu all along lived with his two wives, exercising full conjugal rights (at least subsequently).

[4] Vide infra. sec. on 'niyoga,' *re* Kuntī.

[5] Uśīnara married 4 other dtrs. of 'rājarṣis', and their sons were established in a number of Punjāb principalities named after them, the main line being continued by Śivi: cf. Brahma: 13, 20—24; Hariv. 31, 1674—'79; Vāyu: 99, 18; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 74, 17—20; Viṣṇu: IV, 18, 1. *Re* Viśvāmitra's other wives and sons, cf. references to them in the Triśaṅku stories in all Pur.° and the Kauśika gotra accounts in the same.

[6] E.g. Śatānīka, Nakula's 'dāyāda' (often called Nākuliḥ): cf. Mbh. VII, 1086. (It is to be noted that Nakula's son by an individual wife of his, Niramitra, is not his 'dāyāda'). Prativindhya, her son by Yudhiṣṭhira, is apparently the latter's own 'dāyāda'; cf. Drau.°'s lament in the Sabhā that she cannot bear the thought that Prati.° should be called a slave's son being the 'rāja-putra' (the King's or Yudh.°'s heir).

[7] Mbh. §253 (Haraṇāhar.°) I, 221.

[8] For these individual wives and their sons, vide: Vāyu: 99, 240—'45, Matsya: 50, 51-57; Viṣṇu: IV, 20, 11-12; and numerous refs. in full detail in Mbh. itself to each of these wives and their sons

[9] Mbh. §253 (Haraṇāhar.°) I, 221.

[10] Mbh. V, 120.

For no instance of polyandry, however, is so much detail available as that of Draupadī; and an examination of these details should bring out what polyandry was like[4] in its last days amongst the ruling classes of the end of the Vedic period.

Polyandry in some form seems to have continued longer amongst certain priestly sections (as noted above). When Utaṅka, a pupil of Veda (the 'purohita' of Janamejaya III) is most calmly requested by the latter's wife to take the place of her husband and approach her for the sake of 'virtue,'[5] it is evident that this was not a mere instance of laxity and adultery (which were common enough), but a customary latitude allowed to the brāhmaṇ wife, amounting to polyandry. So also, Uddālaka's[6] 'wife' is free to go with other 'brāhmaṇs,' either of her own will, or in response to invitations, and this fully in accord with 'honoured ṛṣi custom[7]; and Svetaketu is her son by one of her 'husband's' pupils.[8] Such a state of affairs[9] would show that in priestly settlements and retreats, isolated from public city life, resident brāhmaṇs of a group often had a woman or women in common.[1] It is noteworthy that these two instances refer to the Āṅgirasa, Kāśyapa and Ātreya groups,[2] otherwise noted for traces[3] of polyandry and laxity.

---

[1] Mbh. § 304 (Anudyūta °) II, 77 (Duḥ.° 's request); § 300 (Dyūta °) II, 71 (Karṇa's request).

[2] Mbh. §522 (Drau.°-har.°) III, 267.

[3] Mbh. §551 (Kīc.°) IV, 14 ff.

[4] These details are enough for a separate monograph; it is interesting to follow the jealousies and conflicts of the co-husbands, and the changing favours of the common wife, or the legal and social position of the *partis* concerned so far as illustrated in different episodes.

[5] Mbh. I, 3.

[6] Contemp. of Janamejaya III, cf. Mbh. I, 53a, 2047.

[7] Mbh. § 187b. (Pāndu) I. 122. 4724—'35; vide n. 2, p. 153.

[8] Mbh. §635 (Rājadh.°) XII, 34, 1229.

[9] 6 steps further on (cf. Pargiter: AIHT. p. 330) Satyakāma-Jābāla is born of a woman who had connexions with a number of brāhmaṇs in one household (or establishment), so that the parentage of her famous son remained uncertain (Chānd. Upan. IV, 4, 1-2).

For the intervening period[4] between the later Pāṇḍavas and Buddhism, cases of polyandry are not known to the Purāṇic dynastic history.[5] But the great prevalence of metronymics in this age amongst the brāhmaṇs is suspicious, and cannot have been all due to polygamy,[6]—for this was more or less general in various other earlier or later periods, and equally amongst the ruling classes.[7] This crop of metronymics[8] amongst the priesthood must have been therefore partly due to continued laxity[9] and polyandry, in a proportion that cannot very well be determined. Buddhistic references to polyandry are not many, and these are mostly true echoes from the earlier Purāṇic traditions. Thus the story of Kṛṣṇā's marrying the 5 Pāṇḍava princes[10] is told plainly and without fables, with the explanation that she was a passionate girl who fell in love with five youths at the same time, insisted on marrying them all (to which her father agreed rather reluctantly),—and yet craved for a sixth consort;[11] quite in agreement with epic indications, again, Vidura the Kuru (prince and) counsellor warns Arjuna's son against having a wife in common with others,—a calamitous thing for a householder; yet it appears that his own sons had a common wife, on whom he relied for their guidance.[12] The story of Pañcapāpā, the common wife of the princes Vaka and Pāvārika[1] of Kāśi and a neighbouring principality lower down on the Ganges, may however belong to the intervening pre-Buddhist period; and the introduction of Kṛṣṇā's story to illustrate a contemporary statement, that a woman with even eight husbands (apparently the limit reached by fraternal polyandry) yet longs for a ninth,[2] shows that the practice was not infrequent in Buddha's own time. Polyandry as an institution existed in well-known civilized states and communities in the Western sub-Himālayan area,[3] in the post-Mauryan age.[4] It still survives in those outlying 'āryan' tracts of country,[5] and amongst various Tibeto-Burman tribes on their border.

---

[1] In the orthodox 'saṅghas' of Buddha's time (i.e. brāhmaṇical settlements) a few women were common to the whole congregation; (one of them accused Buddha of connexion with her); cf. the almost parallel practice in the late medieval Vaiṣṇava 'maṭhas', etc.

[2] Uddālaka's father Aruṇa was a Gautama (Aruṇa-Aupaveśi-Gautama); so also Uddālaka is stated to have been an Āṅgirasa (Matsya: 196, 4. 6. 8); he however founded an Ātreya gotra (Matsya: 197, 2); Veda, like Uddālaka, was in residence with the Kāśyapa Dhaumya; Veda was also an Āruṇi (Varāha: 37, 7).

[3] Vide ante and infra.

[4] Of 3 centuries, bet. 850 and 550 B. C.

[5] Apparently owing to the concise character of the traditions for these times.

[6] As Keith supposes in his Ait. Āraṇ.

[7] Vide infra. sec. *re* polygamy.

[8] Later on in history there is a parallel prevalence of metronymics in the Andhra inscriptions and coins; but such clear Dravidian character is not evident in the earlier case: though it is possible that some of these metronymics embody traces of matriarchy in the originally non-Aila brāhmaṇ families.

[9] Of this several instances are known in contemporary literature.

[10] Cowell: Jātakas: V, 225—'27; 240; 243.

[12] The basis of this particular may be either the epic tradition of her agreeing to marry Karṇa as her 6th husband, or that of her having a favourite eunuch attendant (Vṛhannalā, whom Arjuna impersonated).

[11] Cowell: Jātakas: VI. 126—139

[1] Cowell: Jātakas: V, 236—239. This is a case of non-fraternal polyandry, the wife being shared in alternate weeks; (cf. the Pāṇḍava arrangements in the Epic); (the story adds that the queen co-opted a third husband to keep her company during her journeys between the two capitals). It is to be noted that all these instances belong to the Gangetic plains.

[2] Cowell: Jātakas: V, 243, (so also, Vidura's warning against polyandry is applied to "all householders", showing that the Jātakas knew it as a not very restricted custom).

[3] In Strī-rājya, Grāma-nārī (next to it), and Vāhlika; the country between and including Kumāon and N. Punjāb. 'Strī-rājya is known to Mbh., where its king is a candidate for the Kaliṅga king's daughter.

[4] Cf. Vāts. Kā. Sūt. II, 6, 41—44; 39, 41 (with comm.); also V, 6, 12 (*re* Strairājaka harems).

[5] E.g. in Rāmpur-Bashāhr, Nārkaṇḍā (corr. to Nārī-khaṇḍa or Strī-rājya, Grāmanārī, etc.), and other districts around and beyond Simlā, amongst the Kanwārīs (who are popularly taken as = 'kinnaras' of literature) and other tribes; many of these are Aryan ethnically; some are supposed to belong to the 'Khaśa' race; others are clearly Mongoloid.

IV.

No case of 'Niyoga' is definitely mentioned in the Epic-Purāṇic tradition until about 41 steps below Manu; the next definite instances being at the 54th, 93rd, 94th, and 97th steps (with one not very long before the 93rd).[1] This rarity in the earlier ages, and increasing number of cases later on, must partly have been due to gradual discouragement of polyandry and widow-remarriage[2] amongst certain sections of the ruling nobility,—partly to increasing degeneracy of the polygamous wealthy princes[3],—and partly to the growing pretensions of the priests.[4] The first circumstance would afford the scope for a specialised 'niyoga,' which would otherwise have been superfluous; the second created necessities for dynastic continuity, whose urgency increased with the duration of those lines; the third developed a morbid esteem for introduction of sanctifying 'ṛṣi' blood in the priest-ridden families. Indications of all these circumstances will be noted in the following account.

No definite 'niyogas,' again, are recorded of any other ruling family besides the Eastern Ānavas (Aṅga), Aikṣvākas (Kośala) and Pauravas (the Doāb and Kurukṣetra); while the brāhmaṇ families expressly connected with the practice are the Gautamas (Āṅgirasas) and the Vāśiṣṭhas,—with apparently the Kāśyapas and the Ātreyas,[5]—all connected with those regions and dynasties. There are a few probable cases amongst the Pāñcālas, Kānyakubjas and later Yādavas,[6] but hardly any traces amongst the Turvaśas, Druhyus, W. Ānavas, Haihayas,[7] Kāśis[8] Vaiśāleyas[8] and Vaidehas.[8] It would seem as if the practice originated in the eastern kingdoms and spread westwards along with the Āṅgirasa, Vāśiṣṭha and other priestly groups, in the same way as Mānva Brāhmaṇism can be said to have spread to the Ailas.[1] But the Kāśis, Vaiśāleyas and Vaidehas were as much eastern and priest-ridden as the Aṅgas and Kośalas; the explanation may be the martial character of the two former,[2] and the absence of laxity in the latter.[3] So also the absence of the practice amongst Druhyus, Turvaśas and W. Ānavas may be due to their having been virile fighting communities outside the Mānva-Brāhmaṇ influence; and though connected with the Bhṛgus and Ātreyas, the Haihaya-Yādavas were too strong and martial a race for priest domination,[4] and were vigorous, prolific polygamists, with a good deal of license in the sex-relations.[5] The main position, however, as stated above, is significant: the practice is associated with the Āṅgirasas and Vāṣiṣthas (of Aṅga, Vaiśālī, Kośala and Kuru-Pāñcāla).

---

[1] The numbering is on the basis of Pargiter's comparative lists; the approximate general sequence would stand even if those numberings have to be altered later on. Of Manu's immediate descendants (within 3 steps?), Rathītara's wife is said to have undergone a 'niyoga' to an Āṅgirasa, the resultant progeny being optionally known as Āṅgirasas or 'Kṣatropetāh dvijātayah' (Viṣ. IV. 2, 2 f. and comm. on it; cf. Vā. 88, 7; Bḍ. III. 63, 7; Hv. 11, 658); but acquisition of brāhmaṇ clan name and of the above designation is so frequent amongst Mānva and Aila branch families (vide Pargiter AIHT.), and the alleged instance is so isolated, that it is more probable that the commentators' explanation arose from a var. lec. 'Kṣetropetāḥ, etc.,' in a Bḍ. text.

[2] As with the Hāstinapura dynasty (cf. Bhīṣma's refusal to marry his brother's widows, and the singularity of the Pāṇḍava polyandry)

[3] As with Vali, Vicitravīrya, or Pāṇḍu.

[4] As with Āṅgirasas and Vāśiṣṭhas over various dynasties.

[5] Vide infra for the indications.

[6] Vide infra.

[7] Except what is said in brāhmaṇical stories about the kṣetraja kṣatriyas amongst them after their defeat by the Bhṛgus; vide infra.

[8] Though the Āṅgirasas are directly connected with the Vaiśāleyas and for a time with the Kāśis, while the Vāśiṣṭhas are similarly connected with the Vaidehas.

The first[6] clear instance of the practice (that of Dīrghatamas' sons by Vali's wives)[7] discloses several noteworthy features: There is no sign that it was regarded as unusual or novel. The brāhmaṇ guest is already a privileged person, who is at once sent into the harem to have a pleasant time.[8] The previous history of Dīrghatamas leaves no doubt as to how he used the privilege. It is after this that Vali commands his queen to obtain for him sons from Dīrghatamas, who, like other solicited personages in later instances, agrees forthwith. Sudesṇā also readily assents, but afterwards not liking connexion with a pur-blind man, substitutes a maid-in-waiting[1] (apparently a secondary co-wife, Auśīnarī[2], of the

---

[1] Vide Pargiter: AIHT, pp. 303-14.

[2] About the Kāśis, the mention of the Haihaya wars is enough; for the Vaiśāleyas, vide the graphic account of Mārk.° Purāṇa.

[3] Later on, in Aṣṭāvakra's time, however, there were temptations at the Janaka court (Mbh. III. 133).

[4] Cf. their expulsion and oppression of these priests, leading to wars.

[5] As is evident from the Yādava dynastic accounts, and as noted already.

[6] Earlier legendary reference to 'kṣetraja' sons is very rare; one such is ascribed to a king Svarāṣṭra on the Vipāśā, driven out of his kingdom, whose queen had a son by a 'ṛṣi,' who became the Tāmasa Manu (of uncertain chronological position): vide Mārk.° Pur.°

[7] The details that follow are given in full in: Mbh. § 170 (Dirgh.°): I. 104; (cf. XII. 342, 13182); § 277 (Jarās.°) II, 21; (cf. II, 17. 698; III. 84, 8083; XIII, 7108; 7663; XII. 7593: also XII. 1796). Visnu: IV, 18. 1-2; Brahma: 13, 28 ff; Matsya: 48, 23-24: 58-88; Brahmāṇda: III. 74. 26-34; 36-99; Hariv. 31, 1683-90; Vāyu: 99, 27-34; 35-99; 100-1.

[8] For the much later post-Mauryan period also, Vāts. Kā. Sūt. refers to the practice of allowing brāhmaṇs free access to the king's women, in Gauda specially; does this show the eastern origin of this priestly influence?

W. Ānava family, and thus a cousin of the king). Dīrghatamas then went on begetting one son after another on this Auśīnarī, and it was not until the 11th son had been born that the substitution was made known to Vali,—as he now claimed them from Dīrghatamas; from the details it is clear that Dīrghatamas was allowed to live for all these years within the palace in the same relation to the whole harem as the king himself[3], but all the while he was living specially with Auśīnarī[4]; the claim after the 11th birth is significant; probably the eldest son having completed his 12th year had to be definitely 'affiliated' in view of usual ceremonials. After the disclosure, Sudeṣṇā was sent for 'niyoga' once again, and this time there was no difficulty,—the prolific brāhmaṇ having apparently made the harem all his own. After Sudeṣṇā had borne 5 (or probably 6)[5] sons by 'niyoga,' Dīrghatamas got full rights over Auśīnarī and continued to live with her separately, begetting other children on her, as well as on other women (who may well have been inmates of Vali's seraglio like Auśīnarī). The scene of all this is placed in Girivraja[6], where Dīrghatamas' own family became settled, while the 5 kṣetraja princes settled in 5 different provinces of the original kingdom, which seems to have included a large part of Bengal, Bihār and Orissā, with Girivraja as a chief centre; and later on the 5 princes used to pay visits to their real father in his retreat at Girivraja. Three things are most striking in this common Epic-Purāṇic tradition: the revolting license of the (Āṅgirasa) priest,—the laxity of harem life,—the utterly priest-ridden[7] and incapable type of king.[8] All this

---

[1] 'Śūdrā Auśinarī' may have been her full name; one of the Paurava King Raudrāśva's daughters was named Śūdrā. (Possibly Śūdrā was also the name of Vidura's mother).

[2] Cf. the parallel case of Ambikā the chief queen similarly substituting a 'maid' who is also a co-wife and apparently a princess. Cf. also the Purāṇic legend of Sureṇu's substitute, which shows a similar custom. Auśīnarī, shortly 'Auśi,' is a better source for the metronymic Auśija, than Uśij, which is otherwise unknown as a feminine name; the epic version is clearly in the right here. Princesses in the harem suffering frequent changes of status, owing to royal or their own freaks, was very common all along; cf. Buddhistic references to pre-Bhārata and post-Bhārata court stories, and Vedic references *re* 'parivṛktī,' etc.

[3] Cf. the chosen brāhmaṇ agent 'living with' Śāradaṇḍāyanī till 3 sons are born to her; vide infra.

[4] So also Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana was particularly pleased with Vidura's mother.

[5] Including Anapāna. (It is prob. better to read 'so'paraśca' in the text for 'sāparādha,' etc.; prob. also the real name was Annapāna='food-protector'; cf. Śāli-vāhana).

[6] The epic tradition is very clear and consistent with regard to this location of the episode; so also the Purāṇic: e.g. Mat. 48, 84-88; Vā. 99, 37-99; etc.

[7] Also shown by the brāhmaṇistic economiums on Vali in the Purāṇas.

[8] Cf. "he was born when the race had dwindled": Matsya: 48, 23-24; etc.

cannot have developed in a day; the sort of 'niyoga' as exemplified amongst the E. Ānavas and Āṅgirasas, therefore, must have been an accepted and established practice long before the 41st step from Manu; the E. Ānavas had not separated from their more vigorous kinsmen, the N.W. Ānavas, for more than a century and a half,[1] and their rapid degeneration implies some pre-existing tradition of harem life and priest-influence in the land of their settlement, already peopled by the 'Saudyumna' and Mānva races.[2]

The 'niyoga' of Madayantī, Kalmāṣapāda's queen,[3] also, discloses somewhat similar features,—the main difference with the previous case being that Vali takes the practice for granted and is glad to employ it, while Saudāsa-Aikṣvāka is an unwilling victim of it. It would almost appear from the details given about Saudāsa's persecution of Vaśiṣṭhas and Āṅgirasas,[4] the curse of the injured Āṅgirasī, and his final reconciliation with 'Vaśiṣṭha,'—that his queen was part of the price he paid for his restoration (which was assured when Saudāsa had actually solicited Vaśiṣṭha to beget a son on Madayantī), and that there was an element of retaliation and humiliation involved in the whole affair. Madayantī seems to have come into touch with Vaśiṣṭha[5] even before the 'niyoga,' while the king was in exile[6]; and when on return he approaches her, she dissuades him from his desire of begetting a son himself, and then Vaśiṣṭha is asked to visit the queen, with whom he remains till she is with child.[7] On the whole what is an accomplished fact in the earlier case, is shown in the process of being completed, or reasserted after temporary protest and check.[1] It is notable that while nothing is said regarding Vali's merit in lending his wife (or wives) to Dīrghatamas (though he is generally lauded as a pious king), Saudāsa by 'giving his dearly loved queen to Vaśiṣṭha' (not simply 'raising a kṣetraja son') is declared to have 'attained heaven together with that wife': a befitting praise for a fresh or repentant[1] convert to the system.

---

[1] About 14 steps before this, branching off from Mahāmanas, under Uśīnara and Titikṣu.

[2] As the dynastic accounts clearly show; for details, vide Pargiter: AIHT., Chaps. XXIV and XXV.

[3] The following details are given in full in:—Mbh. I, 182, 6888 ff; III, 218, 14128, etc.; I, 122, 4737; 177, 6768; 6791; (cf. 176-177); XII, 49, 1792; 235, 8604; Vāyu: 88, 176 ff; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 63, 177 ff; Viṣṇu: IV, 4, 19-38; etc.

[4] At the instigation of the Aila 'Viśvāmitra.'

[5] So also, while Triśaṅku remained in exile for 12 years, 'Vaśiṣṭha' protected the royal harem and the kingdom, and the latter resented it very much; (in all Pur.°).

[6] One account makes her accompany her husband in his frenzied wanderings; it is not however clear whether the exile had begun then.

[7] And seems to be connected with her later on also.

The next group of clear cases of 'niyoga' (of Vicitravīrya's wives, Pāṇḍu's wives and Uddālaka's wife) are different in features from the above two. They do not show that domination of the king and the harem by the priest in the presence of the king himself. The court life is equally lax and degenerate, if not more so; and the continuance of the dynasty is equally a necessity; but that end is achieved through relatives or equivalents of relatives,—and not through an unconnected priest as such.[2] In these 'niyogas' therefore, another element is present,—the rights of kinship; the practice in this form is a corrollary to and an off-shoot from 'group' or fraternal polyandry, while the form typified by Saudāsa's and Vali's cases is derived from ascendancy and pretensions of the priesthood.[3] This, however, was still present: Kuntī is referred to an (apparently not much) earlier definite instance[4] of the 'niyoga' of a Kṣatriya[5] wife, Śāradaṇḍāyanī[6], who, at her husband's request, came out prepared into the public square[7] and selected and solicited a suitable brāhmaṇ from amongst the passers-by as the agent, and had successivly three sons by him after due ceremonials. Pāṇḍu mentions brāhmaṇs amongst others as suitable agents Kuntī might think of.[8] Bhīṣma, citing in full the instances of the Bhṛgus and Dīrghatamas, recommends a 'ṛṣi' agent to Satyavatī when she presents to him the case of his widowed sisters-in-law.[1] But in these latter instances, Pāṇḍu also mentioned his brothers, friends and 'good men' (equal or superior to him) as his substitutes,[2] —and the first proposal of Satyavatī was 'niyoga' or re-marriage of his sisters-in-law with Bhīṣma (the elder brother) himself, while her last and finally accepted proposal was their 'niyoga' to her own illegitimate son Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana (equally an elder brother)[3]; it was accidental that he was a 'ṛṣi;' he was expressly selected for being an elder brother (on the mother's side)[4], though Bhīṣma is made to approve of it doubly because he was a 'ṛṣi.'[5]

---

[1] The latter is more likely, as the Āṅgirasas and Vāśiṣṭhas were long since intimately connected with the Mānvas, and had other conflicts with them before.

[2] The Paurava princes had many struggles with the brāhmaṇs, and were only partially and for short periods under their sway.

[3] Cf. the claim in AV.: the brāhmaṇ has rights over every wife of every other man; cf. a revolting example in the Epic story of Oghavatī (a Śāryāta-Yādava princess and wife of a Nīla (Paurava) prince of Māhiṣmatī, settled in Kurukṣetra), who was enjoyed by a brāhmaṇ in her gratified husband's presence,—by right: Mbh. § 720. b. (Sudarśanop.°) : XIII, 2, 122 ff.

[4] Mbh. I, 4677-9.

[5] 'Virapatnī' ; but 'Vīra' may be the husband's name.

[6] The name looks brāhmaṇic; she may have been a brāhmaṇ Śaradaṇḍa's daughter married to a kṣatriya or a prince,—not an unusual thing. [*Q.* Is she the same as Śarakānta's dtr. (apparently a corr. reading), w. of Andhaka Mahābhoja (Padma. V, 13, 45)? in that case Kuntī was aptly referred to her example.]

[7] For an Aikṣākava parellel (of somewhat later period perhaps), vide n. 10, p. 220.

[8] Mbh. I, 4680.

The 'niyoga' of Uddālaka's wife to his disciple[6] belongs to about the same age[7]; but though there is one common point, in the selection, as agent, of a person who is almost a member of the same family (in theory, if not by blood,—which was sometimes the case), it stands on a somewhat different footing. As noted already, 'niyoga' of this type is but a form of the general license that prevailed amongst brāhmaṇ settlements (which may have been connected with a sort of 'group' polyandry). The brāhmaṇ disciple indeed was often regarded by the preceptor's wife as being in the status of her husband (as shown by Veda's wife's request to Utaṅka),[8] in spite of all the denunciations and prohibitions of the (later) brāhmaṇ law-givers,—which only show what actual conditions often were. If for instance Utaṅka had consented (as others like him evidently did), Veda would have had a 'kṣetraja' son by a 'niyoga' arranged independently by his wife, because he was absent. It is noteworthy that Uddālakānī's is the first, and probably the only recorded, example of 'niyoga' of a brāhmaṇ woman[9] while brāhmaṇī

---

[1] Mbh. §§ 169-71: 1, 103 ff.

[2] Mbh. I, 4671-80.

[3] Called 'devara' in the text; this word therefore applied to *all* the brothers of a husband; so also Ambikā understands Bhīṣma by 'your devara.' (Prob. the original meaning of 'devṛ' is a person with whom 'dalliance or amour' is permissible even in the married state.)

[4] The one on the father's side declining.

[5] It is to be noted that the Vāśiṣṭhas (to which family Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana belonged) had become connected with the Pauravas from Saṃvaraṇa's days.

[6] Mbh. XII, 34, 1229.

[7] Three or four steps lower.

[8] It is to be noted that Veda was an Āṅgirasa (Gautama), being an Āruṇi; vide ante.

[9] Even this can hardly be called a 'niyoga,' for Uddālaka's wife was certainly not restricted to one husband, and probably the ascription of a 'niyoga' may be nothing more than giving a better name to some acknowledged connexion with a disciple. (In Mbh. XII, 34, 1229, the justification of her case is that connexion with a 'gurupatnī' is no sin if the result is for the benefit of the 'guru').

polyandry is much earlier and more frequent; continued laxity and polyandrous relations probably accounts for this comparative rarity of 'niyoga' among them; besides, lineal and eugenic continuity did not concern the brāhmaṇs much.[1]

In the first of the two Kaurava cases, the 'fraternal' character of the 'niyoga' becomes further clear from the detailed description of it[2]: Satyavatī persuades her elder daughter-in-law to the 'niyoga,' and tells her that a brother of her husband will approach her at night in her own bedchamber; and Ambikā began to think of Bhīṣma and other elders of the Kuru family (evidently the sons of Vāhlīka, elder brother of Śantanu, who were almost always resident at the Hāstinapura court,—though they had inherited their father's maternal uncle's kingdom in the Punjāb)[3]; she seems to have been taken aback when her expectations did not come true, and she found in her room Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyaṇa instead, —evidently, and naturally, hitherto unknown to her[4]: and afterwards she declined to have another son by him. Satyavatī repeated the same instructions to her second daughter-in-law Ambālikā, and she too behaved almost in the same way. The attitude of Ambikā's 'maid' (or co-wife) to Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyaṇa was entirely different: she apparently had no preference for Bhīṣma like the other two princesses, whom he had seven years back abducted at their 'svayaṃvara,' and then made them over to his brother.[5]

All this is the direct evidence of the Epic as it stands now; but there are many indications that some of the original relationships of the Kuru-Pāṇḍava tradition have been revised[6] to suit later tendencies towards edification and mythological explanations; this (latter) is more apparent in the case of Kuntī's 'niyoga' than in the earlier one, for obvious reasons. The 'revision' in the earlier case seems to have consisted in ascribing to one person Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyaṇa all the three 'niyogas,' because he was in a later age regarded as a supernatural 'ṛṣi,'—an incarnation of Viṣṇu,[1]—and because Bhīṣma was becoming more and more an idealized type.[2] Kuntī's case itself proves that it was quite usual to solicit several suitable persons to perform the 'niyoga'; thus Kuntī underwent three different 'niyogas,' and her co-wife Mādrī two (legally equivalent to one),[3]—and more invitations were thought of for both. The reference to Satyavatī's first thought of causing Bhīṣma to continue the line, and to Ambikā's expectation of Bhīṣma and other elder brothers (or cousins) of her husband as agents, is a plain indication of what must have been the original procedure: the last king's next of kin were invited to raise up offspring Hāstinapura), Bhīṣma and Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyaṇa; and the three kṣetraja Kuru princes may well have been begotten by these three relatives on the three wives[6] of Vicitravīrya,—quite in accordance with normal custom. So also, Bhīṣma and Vāhlīka are consistently called direct 'grandfathers' of the Dhārtarāṣṭras and Pāṇḍavas, and 'fathers' of Pāṇḍu, Dhṛtarāṣṭra (and Vidura), equally with Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyaṇa; and on the whole the parental connexion is asserted specially between Bhīṣma and Pāṇḍu (with Pāṇḍavas), between Vāhlīka and Dhṛtarāṣṭra (with Dhārtarāṣṭras) and between Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyaṇa and Vidura;—and this in spite of the reiterated derivation of all of them from the last progenitor.

---

[1] This affected brāhmaṇical genealogies as much as any other circumstance; cf. Pargiter: AIHT. pp. 184-85; Vedic evidence also is very clear on this point.

[2] Mbh. I, 106 (§ 171 : Vic.°-Sutotp.°).

[3] Cf. Mbh. V, 149, 5055-67, etc., for the arrangement, they were yet called 'Kaurava-dāyāda's, etc.,—e.g. VIII, 5, 106, etc.

[4] His parentage was made known to Bhīṣma, for instance, only a few days before the 'niyoga.' All that is said about his being an old 'ṛṣi' with matted locks, etc., is clearly wrong and late, as he was only slightly older than Vicitravīrya, who had died at about 23.

[5] Mbh. V, 173.

[6] The probabilities suggested in the following paragraphs have the great advantage of clearing up a good deal of the tangle of dynastic relationships and resultant claims which led to the great battle; and the parts taken by various people in the epic events-series become more intelligible.

The indications regarding the relatives who may have taken part in the 'niyoga' of Pāṇḍu's wives are by no means so clear. Of course all those fables about invocation of gods are only fables intended to obscure the actual *partis*, so as to remove the ordinary or the discreditable features of the life history of persons made into brāhmaṇical heroes, and impart them something of mystic and divine glamour.[1] Stray references to actual origins, discoverable for the next previous generation, are almost absent for the Pāṇḍavas,—having been evidently laboriously modified or weeded out through centuries. Still some details and incidental notices suggest possibilities, much sounder than those fables. For one thing it is to be noted that the Epic and Purāṇic (and even Vedic) tradition knows of lots of other kings[2] who are said to have been born from Dharma, Maruts, or Indra (or the Aśvins), being their 'portions,' gifts, sons, or incarnations; and these ascriptions to the Pāṇḍavas are by no means a special mythological conception.[3] Thus the detailed development of these common expressions and notions in connection with the Pāṇḍava origins only shows that the details (of 'niyoga' etc.) were already there in the original account, but that there were some facts in it (like similar forms and imports of names) which easily led to those details being ascribed to some of the usual divinities whose prototypes or essences kings were popularly held to be.[4] If at the same time it is remembered that in the same family and in the next previous generation the 'niyogas' (which were the first sources of the Pāṇḍavas etc.) were performed by one or more near relatives, the conclusion becomes irresistible that 'Dharma,' 'Māruta,' 'Puruhūta,' and 'Aśvinau' (with their various synonyms)[5] stand for real kinsmen or relatives of Pāṇḍu whose names happened to be such as to make later identification with those divine beings but an easy step involving no great textual change.[1] In fact on a detailed examination of the Epic and Purāṇic relationships of the Kuru-Pāṇḍava and connected dynasties, it becomes sufficiently clear that 'Dharma' might well represent none other than Vidura-'Dharma' (younger step-brother of Pāṇḍu),[2]—'Māruta,' a Vasu-ite Cedi-Matsya prince of the same name (ruling over a people of also the same name), being a cousin of Pāṇḍu through Satyavatī (and probably the predecessor of Virāta),[3]—'Puruhūta,' Kuntī's foster-father Kuntibhoja's son Purujit, being her cousin,[4]—and the 'Aśvinau,' either one or two (jointly ruling or actually twin) princes of the 'Aśvapati' or Madra family (to which Mādrī belonged).[5] Some of these would thus be relatives of Pāṇḍu through marriage; so also in the earlier 'niyoga,' a relative in the female line is selected as equally good with one in the direct male line.[6] Thus the meaning of Pāṇḍu's recommendation of brothers and suitable relatives as his substitutes is elucidated; indeed, when 'Dharma' is invited by Kuntī, he hurries on a chariot to visit her, and accosts her smiling,—and she too smiles knowingly, and solicits him for a son[1]: there is little of the mythical here, and the description would apply equally to Vidura-Dharma as a 'didhiṣu devṛ' and to Kuntī as a 'devṛ-kāmā.'

---

[1] E.g. in Mbh. XII, 350 (first part).

[2] That he was originally not so, is revealed by Śiśupāla's denunciation and several other episodes connected with his career; on the whole, however, he represents a better type than most other epic personages.

[3] Vide infra.

[4] In fact Vāhlīka and his sons and grandsons represent the Kaurava dynasty proper; the rest are questionable grafts (hence the justification of their continued use of 'Kuru' titles).

[5] Even so, of Kaurava blood, for Satyavatī was of Vasu's line (which is the real basis of the Bhīṣma-Matsya compact).

[6] Who may have had a choice between those three; in that case the story of Ambikā and Ambālikā's dislike of Vyāsa would originate from their actual preference of Vāhlīka and Bhīṣma and rejection of Vyāsa, who thus fell to the lot of the 3rd wife. (Cf. the rejection by Sudeṣṇā of Dīrghatamas who falls to the lot of an inferior queen at first, and the choice by Kuntī herself of the persons for 'niyoga').

---

[1] The prosess is not unique in Indian history; champions caught hold of by brāhmaṇs were translated into myths even in medieval ages, as when the barbarian Gurjadas, etc., were declared to have sprung from Agni at a sacrifice (a fable ascribed to other contexts in Pur.°).

[2] E.g. Drupada born of Maruts : Mbh. I, 67, 2715; so also Sātyaki : I, 67, 2714; and Virāṭa : ibid 2717 (in his case prob. Māruta was also his real patronymic; vide infra.) : so again, Pāṇḍu : XV, 31n. 851; Kṛtavarman : XVIII, 5u, 159; Māndhātṛ : XII, 29, 974; cf. Maruts associated with Marutta (in Pur.°). Similarly other kings are said to be born of other gods.

[3] Hence it is no ground for holding that the Pāṇḍavas were an unknown foreign mountain clan who invaded as usurpers, etc.

[4] Such transitions from facts to myths, from names to fables, is a very common feature of early tradition, whether Purāṇic or Vedic.

[5] Thus Arjuna as 'son of Vāsava' suggests that a related 'Vāsava prince (desc. from Vasu of Cedi) may have begotten Arjuna. But as 'Māruta' stands for one 'Vāsava' prince (vide infra), and as 'Puruhūta' occurs in a genealogical verse, Purujit (Kuntibhoja) is probably the more likely agent (vide infra).

---

[1] So also it seems very likely, from the great laxity in Yādava dynastic morals, that Kuntī's 'kānīna' son by 'Bhānu,' etc., was really by her kinsman Bhānu-Yādava (whose abducted daughter Sahadeva married later on) (vide infra).

[2] Apparently Vidura was also called 'Dharma'; he may have been a 'judicial officer' at the Kuru court (just as he filled other offices); cf. the Aṇi-Māṇḍavya story: Mbh. I, 106, 4302; 107, 4306; XV, 28, 752.754; cf. also the Mbh. account of 'Vidura (=Dharma) entering Yudhiṣṭhira's body after death.' From all this it would seem that Vidura-'Dharma' as judge had punished a brāhmaṇ boy for cruelty, and the brāhmaṇs out of spite spun stories based on his parentage; it also becomes clear how Yudhiṣṭhira could be said to have been begotten by 'Dharma' (so that 'being so begotten no blame could attach' to Kuntī and Pāṇḍu).

[3] Māruta is the name of a Vasu-ite (Kaurava) prince or his line, in the Purāṇas (Cedi genealogy); his line was the same as the Māvellaka or Matsya line (vide Pargiter AIHT. 118-19); Mārutāḥ are a people amongst Yudhiṣṭhiras allies, and so are Māvellakas,—prob. the same as Matsyas. Cf. Mbh. VI, 2083 (Bom. Edn.); etc.

[4] The genealogical verse is Mbh. I, 126, 4921: 'Puruhūtād ayam jajñe Kuntyām eva Dhanañjayah,' for which may be read: 'Purujito hy ayam...........' or 'Purujitas tvayam...........' *Re* Purujit (Kuntivardhana), cf. Mbh. II, 14, 581; V. 172, 5922; VI, 25.0. 834; VII, 23.0., 995; 25, 1103; VIII, 6, 172.

Many other Madra and Kekaya princes were called Aśva-patis. The Mbh. account of Mādrī's m. makes Madra = Vāhlika family; in that case the relationship was double, an earlier Vāhlika prince having had a share in the Vaicitravīrya niyogas. If Madra-Kekaya, then also there was additional relationship through Kuntī's sister and her 5 sons, Kekaya princes; 2 other contemp. Kekaya princes (prob. twins) were Vinda and Anuvinda.

[6] Mbh. §§ 168-171 (Bhiṣ.°-Sat.°): I, 103 ff.

Some other features are also disclosed by the Kuru-Pāṇḍu cases. First, as to the sources from which the practice was adopted: It is not necessary to suppose that, along with Pāṇḍava polyandry, the Epic 'niyoga' implies Himālayan and non-Āryan origins, and that the Pāṇḍavas therefore were uncouth foreigners.[2] It has already been shown that polyandry was known amongst brāhmaṇ and Kṣatriya families of the Gangetic plains in several earlier and later[3] periods; so also, there were earier and later cases of 'niyoga' (as noted above) in various other families and parts of the country, even in the same dynasty. It is *not* a special case here. The only connections discoverable with Himālayan regions are, firstly, the accident of Pāṇḍu's living on Mt. Sataśṛṅga[4] at the time of the 'niyoga' (where the reason given for that retirement is sufficient from a common-sense point of view),—secondly, the statement[5] that on the birth of the 3 kṣetraja sons of Vicitravīrya, the Uttara and Dakṣina-Kurus vied with one another (which would rather point to the Vaicitravīryas being foreigners, if at all),—and thirdly, the inclusion of some Himālayan tracts within Yudhisthira's dominions (which fact is later than the cases in question).[6] The Kuru-Pāṇḍavas may have, more probably adopted these practices of polyandry and 'niyoga' (if they were not known to them before,—which is not very likely) from the Vāśiṣṭhas, Āṅgirasas and Kāśyapas, they came so in contact with; specially from the days of Bharata[1] onwards. Bhīṣma relies on Āṅgirasa precedent of 'niyoga,' Pāṇḍu on that as well as Vaśiṣṭha; a Vāśiṣṭha takes part in the Vaicitravīrya 'niyogas,' and various 'ṛṣis' justify the birth of Pāṇḍu's sons; a Kāśyapa priest (Dhaumya), and that Vāśiṣṭha, advise, sanctify and legalise the Pāṇḍava polyandry, without objections and armed with precedents.[2]

---

[1] Mbh. I. 122 ff.; the next 'agent' also approaches her smilingly, and Kuntī is here 'salajjā' as well as smiling; she would naturally have been less familiar with the Māruta-Matsya cousin than with Vidura.

[2] A view repeated in many very recent works.

[3] E.g. in Buddhistic references.

[4] Such retirements for various reasons (real or alleged) of one of the brothers are not uncommon in the dynastic tradition: e.g. Yati, Jyāmagha, Devāpi, etc.; probably Pāṇḍu was actually exiled with his wives by Dhṛtarāṣṭra, in the same way as the Pāṇḍavas were ousted by Duryodhana.

[5] This might be taken to indicate that 'niyogas' were commoner in Uttara-Kuru (where another primitive custom, that of sister-marriage, sp. bet. twins, was an established one, acc. to Mārk.° Pur.°; also unrestricted polyandry, acc. to Pāṇḍu in the Epic.).

[6] A large portion of the Southern Himālayan region was, from much earlier times, under the Aikṣvāka (Mānva) and W. Ānava kingdoms. That part of it where Pāṇḍu went to live, corresponds to modern Gaḍhwāl, Sirmur and Kanawār (der. popularly from 'Kinnara'), where polyandry is still recognized. The Kinnaras (=Kanwāris) are named amongst the real human Gandharvas in the Epic; and Draupadī escapes detection by giving out that her five husbands are 'gandharvas'; probably even in the Epic period these Kanwāri 'gandharvas' had the same institution of polyandry as now. These points however do not prove the Himālayan origin of the Pāṇḍava polyandry and 'niyoga'; they only show that while polyandry was becoming rare in the plains it still prevailed in outlying hill districts; the surrounding polyandry at Sataśṛṅga may however have encouraged the 'five' 'niyogas' of Pāṇḍu's wives.

Then as to the number of 'niyogas' permissible: Kuntī is made to say that connexion with the fourth man besides the husband makes the wife a courtesan,[3] and therefore she refused to undergo a fourth 'niyoga'; but she had already exceeded that limit, for actually[4] she had had 4 connexions excluding Pāṇḍu, and she had 4 sons by different fathers who all were or came to be regarded as Pāṇḍu's sons.[5] Pāṇḍu indeed wants to have quite a number of such sons; and he had a precedent for it; Vali had practically 17 sons raised on his two wives, 11 on one and 6 on the other; Śāradaṇḍāyanī raised 3 sons by 'niyoga', and if Vyuṣitāśva's case[6] is really one of 'niyoga,' the number permitted is 7; on the other hand Ambikā had one actual 'niyoga' and another proposal, and Madayantī only one. On the whole therefore the number of 'niyogas' was not restricted by any standing rule; nor was its nature regulated by austere injunctions found in later codes: for in almost all the traditional cases of 'niyoga,' the *partis* take to it with an evident element of initiative[7] and choice, personal feelings and attractions[8]; and very often the wife is allowed to woo and choose afresh one or more persons of her own accord, in view of such temporary unions,—whose duration might be extended considerably (from one night to twelve years or more).[9]

[1] Vide infra, the prob. case of 'niyoga' with Bharata.

[2] The Buddhist echoes of Purāṇio traditions indeed suggest (vide ante) that polyandry was more frequent amongst the Kurus than appears from the Epic, and was known to Pāñcālas, Kośalas, Kāśis, and peoples further down the Ganges.

[3] Cf. the same view in Vāts. Kā. Sūt. quoting Pāñcāla-Bābhravya (at least cir. 600 B.C.). It is interesting that the dictum is given a Pāñcāla origin.

[4] The fact is kept secret from Pāṇḍu.

[5] *Re* Karṇa. cf. "Pāṇḍu's son by 'dharma'": Mbh. V, 140, 4734; 141, 4756.

[6] Vide infra.

[7] E.g. Mādri clearly; Kuntī and Madayantī partly.

[8] The three last features may be found in all the traditional cases.

[9] So that 'niyoga' often verged on 'co-option' of a husband, or biandry, or polyandry: thus Madayantī is said to have been 'given' to Vaśiṣṭha, though she remained Saudāsa's queen all along; cf. Auśīnarī and Śāradaṇḍāyaṇī (ante) 'living' (for long) with their apportioned or selected 'agents.'.

Connected with this is another feature of these 'niyogas' of tradition: continued (political or social) connection with, and (parental or kindly) interest in, the 'kṣetraja' children, on the part of the real progenitors. That of Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyaṇa is inseparable from the Epic events; and so is that of Vāhlīka and Bhīṣma,—if they may be given the status that is almost plainly indicated for them; so also, of the probable originals of 'Dharma,' 'Māruta' and 'Puruhūta' (who as such divinities continue to show parental concern), Vidura's interest in Yudhiṣṭhira is particularly strong, and the only three allies (apart from relations by marriage) that the Pāṇḍavas had at first, were Vidura, Virāṭa the Vasu-ite prince of Matsya, and Purujit the Kuntibhoja. The fatherhoods of Pāṇḍu and Vicitravīrya are but faintly asserted behind the prominent repetitions of the real relationships, which are openly and proudly acknowledged before all and in the presence of all the *partis* concerned; and it is the mothers who are more prominent than the putative fathers (naturally enough, though against the presumption of later law-books), and who give their sons their better-known and more frequently used metronymics,—while the 'actual' patronymics are also applied.[1] In the Vali and Saudāsa cases also there is the same connexion and interest: 'Vaśiṣṭha' remains in touch with both the mother and the son, and his own son 'Parāśara' becomes that other son's guardian after Saudāsa's death[2]; so also Dīrghatamas was often visited by the Vāleya princes, and his other descendants (by another wife of Vali)[3] continued for generations to protect and favour the related Ānava princes.[4] Only in Sāradaṇḍāyaṇī's case the real father passes out of view; but probably not so in the Uddālaka case, if Kahoda[5] is the disciple referred to, as Kahoḍa lived all along with him, and also married Uddālaka's daughter, and her son Aṣṭāvakra and Śvetaketu were closely connected.

Another noticeable feature of the 'niyogas' of tradition is that the majority of them are performed in the *lifetime* of the husband,[6] whose disabilities as such are not always apparent; so that in some cases priest influence (or a polyandric tendency) can have been the only motive. The only clear case of ‘niyoga’ of *widows* is that of Vicitravīrya's wives,—another very probable case being that of Bhadrā-Kākṣīvatī.

---

[1] E.g. 'Dhṛta.° son of Vyāsa': Mbh, I, 1, 95; 60, 2213; 63, 2441; 67, 2719, etc.; cf. § 171 (Vic.°-sutotp.°); VI. 594, etc.; 'Dhṛta.°, son of Ambikā' : 31 mentions; cf. Sōr. Index, pp. 250-52; also 'Āmbikeya': 8 mentions; but 'Vaicitravīrya': 30 mentions.

[2] Vide refs. ante.

[3] All of whom he went to the length of appropriating, apparently because Vali had originally wanted him to beget sons on the chief queen Sudeṣṇā and not on any other wife.

[4] Vide refs. ante.

[5] He was the favourite disciple; Aṣṭāvakra and Śvetaketu were of the same age, and were brought up as 'brothers.'

[6] The case of Veda's wife seems to show that 'niyogas' were allowed during long *absence* of the husband, amongst ṛṣi families at least.

Some curious points are raised by the case of Mādrī. There it is said that inviting twins to a ‘niyoga’ is tantamount to undergoing one only[1]; Mādrī thus shrewdly secured to herself the advantage of connexions with two persons and bearing two sons, while keeping to the letter of her co-wife's stinted permission; Kuntī did not know this point of law,[2] otherwise she too would have, as she declared, invited twins every time. Such *permission* from the elder co-wife is not required in the case of Vicitravīrya's wives,—apparently as the ‘niyogas’ there were mainly on the initiative of Satyavitī; but the Kośala princesses are also said to have been themselves very anxious for having children; while in the other case, Pāṇḍu also himself wanted to have kṣetraja sons. The explanation is to be found in the *nature* of the permission Mādrī had. The notorious ‘mantra of Durvāsas’ which Kuntī allowed Mādrī to use once, suggests a regular system of ‘priestly bans’ or permits for various cases of royal license or transgressions.[3] As already noted, Kuntī's ‘boon’ or permit was not a rare one: at least two other well-known princesses of the Paurava race[4] having got it before her. Durvāsas is said to have granted his absolving permit for free alliances (for progeny) ‘in view of the coming age of distress,’—referring obviously to the degeneracy of the dwindling Kaurava line, where sons proper could not be hoped for.[5] The ‘mantra’ probably consisted of some Atharva-vedic incantations[6] relating to amours and fertility,[7] bearing the name and sanction of that noted Ātreya priest, which forwarded privately to the selected quarters, produced the desired effect easily,[8] by virtue of the authoritative license.[9] This ‘mantra’ of free-choice, therefore, being a *special* Ātreya permit issued on behalf of Kuntī could only be lawfully used by Mādrī with her own consent; thus she had to stop short, when that consent was withheld (even after Pāṇḍu's pleadings),—and apparently Mādrī did not entertain the idea of a 'niyoga' otherwise than by such romantic 'free-choice.'[1]

---

[1] It is to be noted that these details, and the statement that Sahadeva was born one year after Nakula, make it impossible that they were twins,—unless that one year detail is wrong.

[2] This probably also indicates a contemporary custom of twins sometimes having a common wife.

[3] Instances of cheap absolutions of various sorts are not unknown in ‘tradition’; e.g. from brāhmaṇicide, parricide, adultery, etc.

[4] Satyavatī-Vāsavī and Dṛṣadvatī-Mādhavī-Yāyātyā; a similar permit seems to have been granted to meet the difficulties of Draupadī's 5 successive marriages. Vide ante.

[5] As illustrated by the last generation.

[6] “Abhicārābhisaṃyuktaṃ.”: Mbh. I, 4386; 4748.

[7] Examples of which are well known in the Saṃhitās.

[8] None, it is said, could resist the charm of the words of this ‘mantra.

[9] If licenses permitting or ratifying questionable and irregular connexions could be granted to princes by Popes, in modern ages of criticism and unbelief, they could very well have been issued by as powerful and corrupt a priesthood, in a remote ancient age of credulous faith.

Of the 'probable' cases, some are evidently so, only they have not been so designated in tradition,[2]—while others comprise a fairly numerous group, the chief feature of which is the ascription of the birth of sons unto old and childless kings to the propitiation and favour of some ṛṣi who grants boons to their wives, and who often is the hereditary priest,[3] or continues to take an interest in those sons. This latter class as a whole, may or may not imply actual cases of 'niyoga,' but a few of them undoubtedly were, in view of what has already been noted.

Taking cases of the former group in order of sequence, we have, at the 22nd step from Manu, that of Purukutsa's[4] queen obtaining a son for the race in the absence of her husband,—according to the Vedic evidence[5]; and this was apparently through a brother-in-law (who was also another husband, by biandry),—according to the Purāṇic evidence[6]; here 'niyoga' and polyandry are combined. It is to be noted that this is also a Mānva case, and the location is apparently the Narmadā region.[7]

Then, at the 44th step, is the famous case of 'dharma-saṃkrāmaṇa' of Bhāradvāja[8] into the Paurava dynasty. That phrase seems to refer to a 'niyoga' rather than to an 'adoption'[1] for which the description 'saṃkrāmaṇa' would have been enough; even that is hardly appropriate, and rather a rare way of describing it. The phrase yields better sense, with reference to the context and connected tradition, if taken to mean 'introduction of fresh blood (tainting, grafting), through Bharadvāja, in accordance with sanctioned and rightful custom (dharma)',—which explanation is added to many a traditional case of 'niyoga' to justify it. It has already been noted that the context and connected traditions above referred to, show that it was not Bharadvāja himself who became the successor of Bharata, but the son begotten by him, Vidathin or Vidatha,—or, as the Epic tradition has it,[2] Bhūmanyu, the son of Bharata's queen Sunandā-Sārvasenī-Kāśeyī, born after the death of the nine sons. When it is remembered that the Kāśis also were at that time under the influence of Bhāradvāja-Āṅgirasas,[3] as were the contemporary Eastern Ānavas of the adjacent regions, in which dynasty the Āṅgirasa ṛṣi blood had 2 or 3 steps before been fully introduced (i.e., 'saṃkrāmita'),—and that the Āṅgirasas had come into close relations with the Paurava dynasty from the time of Marutta's adoption of Duṣyanta, and also that the Āṅgirasas had intermarried with Marutta's family,[4]—the natural vagueness in the Bharata tradition disappears, and it becomes clear that the successor of Bharata was his 'kṣetraja' son[5] by his Āṅgirasa priest.[6]

---

[1] Thus it would appear that in these cases we have a special type of 'niyoga,' where the wife has free choice of any number of agents.

[2] As will be seen presently, this obscurity has resulted from subsequent purposive handling of the traditional material.

[3] Cases of connections between such chaplains and the queens are numerous in Buddhist stories that refer to Purāṇic tradition. Vāts. Kā. Sūt. recognizes it fully in some courts.

[4] For the uncertainty of the identity of the Vedic and Purāṇic Purukutsas, vide ante.

[5] Vide ante.

[6] Vide ante.

[7] It is well known in 'tradition' that the Mānvas had spread thither some time before the Ailas, who subsequently intermixed with or absorbed them (cf. Pargiter: AIHT. p. 256 ff.). Māndhātṛ and Purukutsa's line seems to have thus branched off towards the S.W., among the Yādavas (like other Aikṣvākas later on). There were actually several Kośalas in the E., S., and S.W., besides the N. and the Central, all colonized by Mānva families of the same stock branching out at different stages in the dynastic sequence. Simply because a king is given in the Aikṣvāka lists, he need not be located at Ayodhyā,—ascription of rule at that city being a meaningless commonplace of later ages.

[8] Harīv. 32, 1726-31; Brahma. 13, 58-60; Vā. 99, 133-53; Mat. 49, 11-34; Viṣ. IV, 19, 4-8.

The next case is that of Vyuṣitāśva,[7] whose place cannot be clearly defined. He is called 'Paurava-vaṃśa-vardhana' in the Epic story, but there is no Paurava Vyuṣitāśva in the lists. The Aikṣvāka Vyuṣitāśva (at about the 81st step) is near enough to Pāṇḍu to be referred to as a precedent; Kuntī refers to Vyuṣitāśva's story in reply to Pāṇḍu's citation of

---

[1] Cf. Pargiter: AIHT. P. 159 ff.

[2] Mbh. I, 94. 3710 ff.; 95, 3785.

[3] Pargiter: AIHT. pp. 164, 220.

[4] Marutta's dtr. Saṃyatā was given to Bharadvāja's uncle Saṃvarta, and another uncle (or step-father) married Bhadrā, dtr. of 'Soma,' prob. referring to an Aila or 'Soma' king (who may be the above Marutta-Taurvaśa). Possibly both 'Saṃyatā' and 'bhadrā rūpeṇa paramā matā' of the texts refer to the polyandrous Mamatā (or 'Māmatā'). (The Taurvaśa and the Mānva Maruttas were contemporaries, and both the neighbouring princes may well have been under the same Āṅgirasa priest domination.)

[5] In that case Bharata's successors could well be called 'dvāmuṣyāyaṇas.'

[6] So also, the parallel between the brāhmaṇical laudation of Vali and Bharata is striking.

[7] Mbh. I, 121.

Saudāsa's case; even if (as is more probable)[1] this story were originally part of Pāṇḍu's exhortation illustrating 'niyogas' and wrongly attributed to Kuntī, the point remains that it comes next to Saudāsa's story, also an Aikṣvāka case; and the Aikṣvākas were at this time well known to the Kurus[2]; thus 'Paurava-vaṃśa-vardhana' may be taken as a vocative referring to Pāṇḍu, and not to Vyuṣitāśva. The story is apparently intended to show the superfluity of 'niyoga,' which it does not. The indications are plain that Bhadrā-Kākṣīvatī (an Āṅgirasa lady descended from Kakṣīvant and Dīrghatamas) had children after the death of her husband, and these were regarded in later ages as *his* children by a legal fiction,—a fact for which 'niyoga' is quite sufficient explanation; here it is no case of posthumous birth, for *seven* sons are born.[3]

The curious statement that the Paurava (or Aikṣvāka) king's sons were '3 Śālvas' and '4 Madras,' is highly suspicious: it is obviously wrong; the true reading would seem to have meant '3 from Śālva, and four from Madra' respectively,—that is of these 7 'kṣetraja' sons 3 were begotten by the Śālva and 4 by the Madra prince, who may have been relatives of the dead king chosen by the queen quite in accordance with custom. And all that is said about Bhadrā's rising up from her husband's dead body and awaiting fruitful connexions in her own bedchamber, is strikingly similar in purport and details to the Ṛgvedic funeral mantras[4] that make over the widow immediately to a relative of the husband. The queen's own descent being expressly traced from a famous 'niyoga,'[5] resort to the same practice is quite intelligible in her case.

As has been noted above, some brāhmaṇicised traditions assert that brāhmaṇs raised offspring on kṣatriya widows after the Haihaya-Bhārgava conflict.[6] This appears to be nothing but a polite way of saying what must have been natural, that the women of the beaten Haihaya chieftains were appropriated wholesale by their victors, and bore them children; these victors were rather the Kāśis and Aikṣvākas[1] than the Bhṛgus alone; so that these fighting priests unscrupulously used the victories gained by their allies in this manner. At any rate this tradition does not prove prevalence of 'niyoga' as a practice amongst the Haihayas (but indicates that the Bhṛgu brāhmaṇs[2] also were conversant with the system, like the Āṅgirasas, etc.). For the Haihayas it only shows a taint in blood[3] owing to disastrous defeat. But it may well have been that powerful brāhmaṇs henceforward had an eye over the harems of chiefs: the instance of Dīrghatamas-Āṅgirasa having the use of a king's harem occurred *just* after this period of Haihaya-Bhārgava conflict and alleged wholesale 'niyogas.'

---

[1] It seems that as later on the propriety of Kunti's making some protest was felt, the less known story of Vyuṣitāśva was amended to form a reply.

[2] E.g. through Hiraṇyanābha and Ugrāyudha, Śantanu's first wife 'Bhāgīrathī,' the two wives of Vicitravīrya ('Kauśalyās'), etc.

[3] And for that reason also, no case of begetting in sick-bed before death; the account also involves another absurdity of keeping a dead body unburnt or unburied for 7 years.

[4] Also to the case of Vicitravīrya's widows.

[5] Even if the Kakṣīvant referred to is the Pajrīya one, the Āṅgirasa connection remains, specially as the Pajrīya Kakṣīvant married the daughters of an Āṅgirasa lady, Romaśā (w. of Svanaya).

[6] Cf. Mbh. I, 64, 2459-64; 104, 4176-8; XIV, 29, 833; etc.; of Brahmāṇḍa: III. 46, 30 ff.

Irāvat,[4] the son of the Nāga princess Ulūpī and heir to the Kauravya-Nāga kingdom, was probably begotten by Arjuna by way of a 'niyoga.' One version makes her the widowed and childless 'snuṣā' of the Kauravya king, another the widowed and childless 'sutā'; the latter is not probable, as Irāvat is later on said to have been expelled[5] from the Kauravya court (where he was brought up by his mother) by his wicked 'pitṛvya,' through hatred of Arjuna, though Irāvat had been recognised as the heir to the Nāga kingdom. Clearly 'sutā' is an emendation in favour of Arjuna (the 'brahmacārin'); there could be no case of a 'putrikāputra' succeeding (as with Citrāṅgadā) when a son was present; it was his 'snuṣā' whom Kauravya bestowed upon Arjuna for an heir, when she was herself desirous of offspring; and the 'pitṛvya' referred to was thus a younger brother of the deceased Nāga prince, who was displeased at the prospect of a kṣetraja son of the elder brother getting the throne.[6] Ulūpī apparently was eagerly looking for a suitable 'agent' with the permission of her father-in-law,[1] when she met Arjuna at Gaṅgādvāra, and persuaded him to accompany her to the Nāga palace close by and stay with her for a short time till she conceived of him.[2] The details of her adventure and advances show that the initiative in the matter was almost wholly hers, bearing a striking similarity with Śāradaṇḍāyanī's case in regard to the quest and random selection.[3]

---

[1] I.e. under the famous Pratardana and Sagara; probably also aided by Aṣṭaka (Kānyakubja), Uśīnara (Upper Doāb and E. Punjāb), and Vasumanas (Kośala). See Pargiter: AIHT. pp. 268-71, etc.

[2] Later on some cases occur of sons to kings being born through favour of Bhārgava ṛṣis (vide infra).

[3] But acc. to another version (Mbh. XII. 49) brāhmaṇs also were similarly tainted in blood during the Haihaya disturbances, while ruling families got intermixed with indigenous tribes like Rksas and Golāṅgulas.

[4] Mbh. § 585. b. (Bhīṣma-vadha.°): VI, 90; cf. 83, 3661.

[5] After which Irāvat repaired to Arjuna, then preparing for the great battle in the Himālayan regions, and joined in his enterprise.

[6] The parallel with the Dhārtarāṣṭra dislike of the Pāṇḍavas is striking; the want of this feature in the previous generation strengthens the presumption that Bāhlīka and Bhīṣma were the real progenitors of the elder Vaicitravīryas.

To the second group of the 'probable' cases belong the following in order of sequence[4]:—The birth of Viśvāmitra-Viśvaratha (Aila-Kauśika) (31) through the favour of Ṛeīka (Bhārgava)[5];—of the sons of Sagara (Aikṣvāka) (41) through that of 'Aurva' (Bhārgava)[6];—of Damayantī-Vaidarbhī and her three brothers (Yādava) (50 or somewhat earlier) through that of a ṛṣi Damana[7];—of the sons of Ajamīḍha (Paurava-Bhārata) (52) through that of 'Bharadvāja' (Āṅgirasa-Bhārata)[8];—of the son of Daśaratha-Lomapāda (E. Ānava) (64) through that of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga-Vaibhāṇḍakī (Kāśyapa)[9];—of Haryaṅga (E. Ānava) (67 or 73) through that of Punarbhadra-Vaibhāṇḍaki (Kāśyapa)[10];—of Jarāsandha-Vārhadratha (Paurava-Māgadha) (92) through that of Caṇḍakauśika (Āṅgirasa-Gautama)[11]; of the son of 'Sṛñjaya'-Pāñcāla (bet. 66 and 93) through that of 'Nārada' (Kāśyapa-Pāñcāla)[12];—of Draupadī and Dhṛṣṭadyumna (Pāñcāla) (94) through that of Yāja and Upayāja (Kasyapa)[1];—and of the children of Satadhanvan-Hārdikya (Yādava) (94) through that of 'Cyavana' (Bhārgava).[2] Apart from the old age of the 'father' and his childlessness, and the concerned ṛṣis belonging to clans otherwise associated with the 'niyoga' practice, the special circumstances that may have a bearing on the probability in each case, are:—In the first: the alleged complete Bhārgava priest-domination over Viśvāmitra's grand-parents, Kuśika and his queen,[3]—the visit of Paurukutsī[4] to the Bhārgava retreat where she too conceived along with her daughter Satyavatī,[5]—the continued Bhārgava-Kauśika 'sambandha,'[6]—and other previous and subsequent Bhārgava intermixtures with royal families[7];—in the second: previous Bhārgava connection with Sagara's parents, the sonless and aged Vāhu and his Yādavī queen,[8]—and the alleged contemporary prevalence of 'niyogas' of ladies of the ruling nobility to Bhārgava priests[9];—in the fourth: the well-known previous 'dharma-saṃkrāmaṇa' of Āṅgirasa-Bhāradvāja blood into the Paurava-Bhārata dynasty,[10]—and the continued connection of the Bhāratas with the so-called Bharadvājas, practically a branch of that dynasty[11],—in the fifth (and the sixth): the unique nature of the enticement of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga into the royal harem,[12] where his position is very similar to that of Dīrghatamas in the harem of Lomapāda's ancestor,—and the continued Ānava-Kāśyapa connection shown by two 'boons' of offspring

---

[1] It is remarkable that the Jātaka tradition also attributes the birth of the ancient king Sagara-Brahmadatta of Kāśi to such a quest for a suitable consort on the part of a widowed and rather forward Nāga princess, who met the exiled Kāśi heir-apparent; (vide infra). This is interesting for Nāga ethnology. Ulūpi is repeatedly asserted to be a dtr. of a Kauravya family; so either she solicited a consanguinous 'niyoga' or the Nāgas of Gaṅgadvāra were Kurus as much as the Hastināpura family. There are many other illuminating statements about Nāgas in the Epics and Purāṇas.

[2] Mbh. § 248 (Arjunavana.°): I, 214.

[3] Vide ante; it is to be noted that Kuntī also was descended from Āryaka the (Kauravya) Naga (through female line).

[4] But not in order of probability.

[5] Vā. 91, 64-89; Brahmāṇḍa. III, 66, 35-60; Br. 10, 29-50; Hariv. 27, 1432-52; Viṣ. IV., 7, 8-15; Mbh. III, 115 (Jamad.°); § 638. b. (Rāmop.°).

[6] Mat. 12, 39-42; so also Viṣ. IV, 3, and Brahmāṇḍa. III, 63; cf. Sagara and wives soliciting Vaśiṣṭha and then other ṛṣis for sons: Br. 78, 3-11; cf. Mbh. III, 106 ('penances' of sonless Sagara & wives and 'boons' to them).

[7] Mbh. § 344 (Nalop.°): III. 53, 2077-80.

[8] Vā. 99, 163-4; Mat. 49, 45-6.

[9] Vā. 99, 104; Br. 13, 40-43; Harīv. 31, 1696-8; Mat. 48, 95-6.

[10] Mat. 48, 98-99; Hariv. 31, 1700-1701; vide n. 9 above; cf. the earlier case of Aṅga's birth in Bali-Ānava's line.

[11] Mbh. II, 17

[12] Mbh. VII., 55; XII, 31.

---

[1] Mbh. I, 167 (Drau.° Sambh.°). But taken together with the Jātaka version of Kṛṣṇā's origin, this account would seem to be rather that of the formal affiliation to Drupada and his sister-queen of the twin children of the Kośala queen abducted by him during pregnancy. At any rate Yāja is stated to have summoned the queen Pārṣatī to receive offspring from him, and when she pleaded personal unpreparedness for the process, to have assured her that *her* person would not be required, but that the offspring was ready for affiliation to her. The details thus show that Pārṣatī had at first expected a 'niyoga', but the ritual arranged privately between Yāja and Drupada was found to be intended for the 'Sahoḍha' children of the Kośala queen.

[2] Hariv. 39, 2037; perhaps the necessity of 'niyoga' arose when Śatadhanvan was slain by Kṛṣṇa during the Syamantaka adventures: Vā. 96, 20-98; Br. 17, 1-40.

[3] Mbh. § 745. c. (Cyavanop.°): XIII, 52-56, sp. 52 and 55.

[4] Mbh. § 638. b. (Rāmop.°): XII, 49, 1721 ff.; vide n. 5 below.

[5] Viṣ. IV, 7, 8-15; Br. 10, 29-50; Hariv. 27, 1432-52; Brahmāṇḍa. III, 66, 35-60; etc.; Mbh. III, 115; vide n. 4 above.

[6] Vide n. 3 above; cf. Br. 10, 63. 64-66; Hariv. 27, 1457. 1468-70; Vā. 91, 97 ff., etc.

[7] E.g. through Devayānī or Jamadagni with Aila or Mānva families.

[8] Viṣ. IV, 3, 15-18; Br. 8, 29-46; Hariv. 13, 760 ff.; Vā. 88, 120-139; Brahmāṇḍa. III, 63, 119-133; Padma. VI, 21, 17-42 Vāhu's w. soliciting 'Bhargava').

[9] Vide n. 6, p. 179.

[10] Vide ante, pp. 177-79.

[11] Vide Pargiter: AIHT. pp. 112; 247-50.

[12] Mbh. III, 110, 9989 to 113, 10093; Rām. I, 9 and 10; cf. Viṣ. IV. 18, 3.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

within a few generations[1] ;—in the seventh : the precedent of Vali and Dīrghatamas, where the ṛṣi family concerned as well as the locality are the same,[2]—and the notorious connection of the Gautamas with Girivraja from Vali's time to Jarāsandha's[3] ;—in the eigth : similarity with the Viśvāmitra and Lomapāda cases,—in all three a ṛṣi son-in-law[4] being the source of the son.

Dhṛtarāṣṭra's sons (94) are said to have been born through the favour of Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana, on whom Gāndhārī attended to his satisfaction[5] ; but as it is also said that the 'boon' was a divine one, and elsewhere that the sons were directly begotten,[6] it is not a likely case of the above group. Ugrāyudha (Dvimīḍha-Pāñcāla) (90) is said to have belonged to the Solar dynasty[7]; his father or ancestor Kṛta (89 or 84) was a famous disciple of Hiraṇyanābha-Kauśalya (83) [8] ; and that strange particular may be the indication of some infusion of esteemed Kośala blood into the Pāñcāla family in the time of Kṛta.[9]

There is another fairly numerous group of cases, where sons are said to have been born to kings in their extreme old age, not through ṛṣi favour, but by virtue of austerities and divine boons.[10] The instances of 'Aśvapati' of Madra (later than 30),[11] Dīrghatapas of Kāśi (15),[12] Uśīnara of the Punjāb

---

[1] Dāśarathi-Caturaṅga and Haryaṅga were in the 7th and 10th steps from Aṅga.

[2] Vide n. 11, p. 181; Caṇḍa-Kauśika here seems to mean son of a Kuśa (a desc. of Kakṣivat Gautama), who was called the 'Caṇḍa'; for locality cf. p. 165 *ante*. and n. 6 there.'

[3] Vide n. 6, p. 165 and n. 11 p. 181. Cf. Mbh. II, 760, 802, 807, 886; III, 8083; etc.; also XII, 168-73.

[4] Nārada was apparently also a cousin, of a collateral Pāñcāla family; he is very frequently called a desc. of Parameṣṭhin (vide Sör. Index, pp. 538-9), and P.° was one of the famed ancestors of the Pāñcāla group of families (counting many ṛṣi families among them : cf. Pārameṣṭhya ṛṣis, Sör. Index, p, 539). N.°'s connection with the Sṛñjayas and Pāñcālas, and his m. with S.°'s dtr. (a cousin) is thus quite intelligible (as also this probable 'niyoga').

[5, 6] Mbh. § 180 (Sambh.°) : I, 115. Cf. I, 95, 3809; 110, 4371 ff. (Śiva's boon); 4378; 4522; etc.; but cf. I, 4558 ('ārṣaḥ sambhavaḥ' of the Dhārtarāṣṭras).

[7] Mat. 49, 61; vide n. 8 below.

[8] Vā. 61, 43-44; Brahmāṇḍa, III, 35, 38-49; Viṣ. III, 6, 4-7; also Hariv.; vide n. 7 above.

[9] Note that the famous Vyuṣitāśva 'niyoga' occurred only 1 step above Hiraṇyanābha (83).

[10] It is possible that in some of these cases, the whole process and result of 'niyoga' are thus summarised and concisely put in an acceptable manner.

[11] Mbh. III, 293, 297, 299; his children were called by the metronymic 'Mālavāḥ' : 297, 16807.

[12] Br. 11, 36-7; Hariv. 29, 1522; Vā. 92, 7-19; Brahmāṇḍa, III, 67, 8.20.

(26),[1] Pratīpa of Kurukṣetra (87),[2] or Jyāmagha of Vidarbha (38),[3] are some of the best known in tradition.

Connected with 'niyoga' are some other cases of 'kṣetraja' sons (accepted as such) known to tradition, technically belonging to the categories of 'gūḍhaja,' 'kānīna,' etc. It is noteworthy that the definite examples of such sons occur amongst ruling families chiefly in the period just before the Bhārata war.[4] The queen of Ugrasena (Yādava) (90), a Vaidarbhī-princess[5] while on a short visit to her father's capital and disporting herself in his pleasure gardens, was beguiled by one Gobhila (who had impersonated Ugrasena) into cohabitation with him, and after the discovery of the fraud was abandoned by him in pregnancy; she then returned to Ugrasena, and the son she bore was Kaṃsa, 'son' and successor of Ugrasena.[6] Kuntī's 'kānīna' son, Karṇa (92), is recognized as 'by law the son of Pāṇḍu'; Kṛṣṇa asserts it, and Karṇa himself acknowledges it, while Draupadī also agrees to this status; in fact, on the eve of the great battle and after it Karṇa is almost generally taken to be virtually the eldest 'kṣetraja' son of Pāṇḍu and thus heir to the throne.[7] But it is rather different with Satyavatī's 'kānīna' son (90), who is definitely 'Pārāśarya' and 'Pārāśara's dāyādaḥ,' and not Śāntanava, though he is claimed as elder brother of Vicitravīrya through his mother and younger brother also of Bhīṣma, and is permitted the privileges that would have belonged to Śantanu's own son.[8] Unlike Kuntī's 'kānīna' son, her sister Śrutadevā's apparently similarly born son Ekalavya (92) is not recognized as the Kāruṣa king's own son; he too, like Karṇa, seems to have been abandoned, to be brought up by a Niṣāda chieftain, but not subsequently affiliated like him to the mother's legal husband.[1] According to the Buddhist version of Epic tradition,[2] Draupadī and her brother, instead of being the miraculously born children of Drupada and Pṛṣatī, were born of the Kośala queen, who was carried off in her pregnancy by the victorious king of 'Kāśi' (i.e. S. Pāñcāla, with which it was at that time often amalgamated, as also with Kurus) after her husband's fall in battle, and gave birth to those children (twins evidently) as wife of the latter king, who accepted them as *his* children. Apart from greater credibility, this version remarkably confirms the contemporary view of 'kṣetraja' children, as exemplified in the case of Ugrasena and others. The story of Mataṅga,[3] son of a 'brāhmaṇī' by a low-class paramour, who was yet regarded as the 'son' of the 'brāhmaṇ,' is not definitely ascribable to any particular time.[4] According to the 'Rāmāyaṇic' tradition, 'Hanumant' (65) was such a 'kṣetraja' son of Keśarin, recognized as son in spite of illegitimacy, as were also the 2 sons (Vālī and Sugrīva) of Ṛkṣa's wife.[5]

---

[1] Br. 13, 20-24; Hariv. 31, 1674-9; Brahmāṇḍa, III, 74, 17-20; etc.

[2] Mbh. I, 97; v. 3832 seems to state that Śāntanu was so called being the son of P.° after his death, i.e., by 'niyoga'; v. 3799 is in explanation of the frequent statement that Ś.° was Mahābhiṣa-Aikṣvākava, 'reborn'; for 'mahābhiṣa'=the great healer; this again seems to conceal a real dynastic fact that P.°'s w. bore to M.° by 'niyoga' a son Śāntanu-Māhābhiṣa, who also married a 'Bhāgīrathī' or Ikṣvāku princess, previously promised to P.° or married to him.

[3] Viṣ. LV, 12, 2-15; Hariv. 37, 1981-9; etc.

[4] This shows that in court circles 'kṣetraja' sons by lawful 'niyoga' had become so common that those by occasional illegitimate agencies did not rouse much comment and could become quietly affiliated. The view that the Pāṇḍu 'niyogas' were a Himālayan *novelty*, becomes therefore untenable.

[5] Prob. Bhīṣmaka's sister; having slain the son of a Vaidarbhī princess, Kṛṣṇa naturally incurred the enmity of Bhīṣmaka and his descendants.

[6] Padma II, 48-51.

[7] Mbh. V, 137; 140-43 (sp. vv. 4734 and 4756); cf. 144-46; also VI, 43; 122; XII, 27B, 817 (cf. 42*y*, 1488; XI, 27). Karṇa is called 'Kuru-vīra,' 'Kuru-mukhya,' etc., along with Arjuna, also by himself; e.g., VIII, 4925.

[8] Mbh. VI, 134; cf. XII, 350, 13643; XIII, 18, 1341; vidé pp. 168, 169, ante.

---

[1] Vide p. 158 *ante*, and n. 1 there. It is possible that another sister of Kuntī, Śrutakīrttī, m. to a Kekaya king, also underwent some sort of polyandrous 'niyoga': she too had 5 sons who were expelled from sovereignty by other Kekaya princes and joined the Pāṇḍavas to regain their kingdom (cf. Mbh. V. 22, 664 and Sör. Index, s.v. Kaikeya, etc.; also Vā. 96, 145 ff; Viṣ. IV, 4, 11; etc.).

[2] Cowell: Jāt.° V. 225 ff.; vide n. 1, p. 182, and n. 2, p. 132.

[3] Mbh. XIII. 27-29.

[4] But the mention of Mataṅga's austerities and influence at Gayā and the very name of Mataṅga, probably indicate some close connection or identity with the famous Triśaṅku-Mataṅga (32), the 'Caṇḍāla,' of Kīkaṭa,—whose father Tryaruṇa was a Ṛgvedic ṛṣi. Cf. Nanda parallels later on.

[5] Mbh. III, 147, 11193 ff.; also Rām.; Brahmāṇḍa, III, 7, 212-16; etc.

V.

The traditional evidence regarding widow-remarriage *as well as* widow-burning, is comparatively meagre: no very early instances can be discovered; it is only towards the close of the period covered by the traditional sources that several definite cases crop up. Evidently, during the greater part of that period, widow-remarriage was more or less taken for granted, or was superfluous owing to prevalence of 'niyoga,' or customary transference, to elder or younger brothers-in-law,—and no special social conditions had arisen[1] to develop a *custom* of widow-burning. It is striking that most of the early instances of this latter practice refer to the Mānvas and in a less degree to connected Yādavas; while the later instances belong chiefly to the Yādavas, and partly to one or two other closely connected families: it seems possible that with the early Mānvas the practice was original, being a relic of not uncommon primitive beliefs and institutions,—while the later Yādavas adopted it under the stress of the struggles and disasters of their age. It is also remarkable that remarriages of widows or '*equivalents*' are almost exclusively noticed in their prevention or subsequent non-occurrence,—except occasionally where the woman concerned is either a 'nāga,'[2] dasyu,'[3] 'vānara' or 'rākṣasa,'[4] or primarily in the possession of some 'asura' (etc.), who is killed[5];—which would indicate that those few preventions and these latter mixed cases were the exceptions to and special cases of a general and therefore unemphasised usage of remarriage. The distribution of the references also points to such remarriages being commoner in the Madhyadeśa (Kuru-Pāñcāla and Kāśi-Kośala) towards the close of our period.

In a number of instances the line between widow-remarriage and 'niyoga,' or 'brother-in-law marriage,' or even polyandry, can hardly be clearly drawn: e.g., in the already noticed cases of Ulūpī (94), Ambikā and Ambālikā (92), Bhadrā-Kākṣīvatī (81? or 42?), Purukutsānī-Narmadā (22), Tārā and Mandodarī (65). But if they are not unalloyed

---

[1] Like continued foreign invasions and domination in the medieval period.

[2] E.g. in the case of Ulūpī (already noted), and that of the Kāśi king Sagara-Brahmadatta's mother, who was a 'Nāga' widow remarried. (Jātakas: Cowell: VI, 81).

[3] E.g. in the case of the Gautama who married a 'dasyu' widow in an Eastern country (vide infra).

[4] E.g. the cases of Tārā and Mandodarī, noticed infra and elsewhere.

[5] Vide infra.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

widow-remarriages, they clearly imply that custom for those times. In another group of cases there is no proper 're-marriage of a widow,' but rather 're-connection of an equivalent of a widow'; e.g., where on ousted, or vanquished chieftain's wife is approached or appropriated by the victor,[1]—or where a queen sets up her paramour as the king after murdering her husband,[1]—or where a dowager queen goes to live with a chaplain,[1]—or where fair ladies are abducted by 'assuras' etc., and rescued, either forthwith or after long stay with the abductor, by heroes who subsequently marry them. Cases like these, as well as the readiness with which the claims of several princesses to restored maidenhood were admitted, and their easy and normal subsequent 'remarriages,' show that, of the later objections to widow-marriages, a principal one had little force in those days.

Taking the few probable indications of and direct references to such 're-connections' and re-marriages all together, they are found to be thus distributed regionally and by groups :—

Amongst the Mānvas: Bhalandana's son Vatsaprī (8), of the Vaiśālī line, rescued the youthful Mudāvatī, daughter of his father's friend King 'Vidūratha' of the Nirvindhyā region (evidently an early Yādava), from her abductor Kujṛmbha, whom he slew; he then married her, though she had lived with that Kujṛmbha for a considerable length of time.[2] Several other similar instances are known to Vaiśāleya tradition.[3]

---

[1] Such cases are frequent in the Buddhist versions of the Purānic tradition. Cf. Cowell : Jātakas : VI, 244 (a N. Pāñcāla case); V, 225 ff. (Brahmadatta's widow living with his chaplain : also a N. Pāñcāla case); in the first instance there is a full remarriage, the murdered king's son calling the paramour (step-)father; the first and third varieties are however indicated by Epic-Purāṇic statements themselves (e.g. *re* Nahuṣa and Ugrāyudha, and *re* Brahmadatta's wife.

[2] Mark. 113 ff.

[3] In Mārk.°Pur.° 113-36. Thus Avīkṣit (39) married the Vidiśā princess Vaiśālinī-Bhāminī after rescuing her from an abductor, whom he slew (he had declined to marry her before, having been defeated before her at her svayaṃvara, where he had seized her); again, Dama (42) married Sumanā-Dāśārṇī after she had been seized from him by the Madra and Vidarbha princes, whom he slew or defeated and thus rescued her. The Mārk. ° Pur. ° also gives (31-35) a Kāśi parallel to Vatsapri's case, where Pratardana's son and Alarka's father Vatsa-Ṛtadhvaja (42) rescued Madālasā from the inner apartments of the abode of her abductor, and married her after a romantic adventure. To an uncertain but a remote early period (pre-Mānva, referring to Auttami-Manu) the same Pur.° ascribes (69-72) two instances of abduction, of Uttama's queen and of a 'brāhmaṇī,' and the subsequent smooth restoration of both to their husbands.

The famous Aikṣvāka, Satyavrata-Triśanku (32), appropriated to himself the newly-married wife[1] of a 'Vidarbha' prince (Yādava),[2] whom he apparently slew[3] in battle with his supporters, and had by her a son Viṣṇuvṛddha. It is said that the capture was not quite illegal (though disapproved by King Trayyāruṇa and 'Vaśiṣṭha'), as the marriage was not yet technically complete; still the point remains that he was regarded by many to have virtually made another's wedded wife forcibly his own, and also that he was by some others thought to have been unjustly banished for such capture, which was actually common in dynastic history even in later times[4]; the legal point of the '7th step'[5] is apparently a later gloss to justify the great Viśvāmitra's support of Triśaṇku: for the completion of the early Vedic marriage did not depend on the 7th step,'[6] but on 'pāṇi-grābha' of the bride and on subsequent home-coming and consummation. Triśaṇku also seems to have similarly appropriated an ordinary citizen's wife,[7]—unless the two notices refer to the same facts.

Ṛtuparṇa-Aikṣvāka (51, or 42?) is connected inseparably with the ancient and genuine Nala-Damayantī tradition (Yādava); according to this,[8] Damayantī, in order to find out whether the reported new charioteer of the Kośala king was Nala himself, despatched messengers to Ṛtuparṇa's court to inform him that she had decided to hold a *second* 'svayaṃvara' very shortly, no trace of her missing husband being yet found; and Ṛtuparṇa at once set out for Kuṇḍina to have his chance of obtaining Damayantī as wife. Damayantī adopts this ruse with her mother's consent (though her father knew nothing about it), and it leads to no graver consequences than a pretty little scene of lovers' pique, and Ṛtuparaṇa's polite apology. It is quite evident from this case, that in both the Vidarbha-Yādava and the Kośala-Mānva circles remarriage of widows or 'equivalents' was not discountenanced, and were quite ordinary occurrences.

---

[1] Brahmāṇḍa: III, 63, 77-114; Vā. 88, 78 ff.

[2] An anachronism: apparently a slip for Videha (Mānva),—quite a common error. Or Vidarbha may have been used by anticipation here, and means only 'Yādava.'

[3] Prob. the unmeaning 'hatvā divaukasaṃ' of the texts stands for 'hatvā Vidarbhakaṃ' or '°Videhakaṃ.'

[4] Cf. Ugrāyudha preparing to take away Śantanu's widow; and the several references in the Jātakas to ancient kings of Kāśi or Pāñcāla similarly abducting the queens of other defeated and slain kings.

[5] All the Purāṇas do not agree with regard to this '7th step'; some have 'pāṇi-grahaṇa mantras' instead.

[6] Besides, as the marriage which Triśaṅku interfered in was evidently a kṣatriya one, it must have been complete (cf. Mark. ° Pur. ° 13-36, where in conn. with Dama's marriage with Sumanā, these points are discussed in the Svayaṃvara assembly) by the simple step of stating mutual consent, or placing the wreath of choice, or grasping of hand in defiance of assembled kṣatriyas,—before Triśaṅku carried the bride off. Even after such completion, diverse 'ceremonies' of marriage were gone through, as in the Epic svayaṃvaras, but that had only a social, and no legal value; these ceremonies might be performed long after consummation. Prob. it was during such secondary ceremonials that Triśaṅku abducted the bride, and thus plainly violated the marriage, and took to wife an actual 'punarbhū' or 'anyapūrvā.'

[7] Brahma: VII, 98 ff.; Hariv. 12, 717 ff.

[8] Mbh. III, 62-79, sp. 69-77.

For the time of Rāma-Dāśarathi (65) there are two *mixed* cases of widow re-marriage (as already noticed) amongst the aboriginal (but civilized) races of S. E. Deccān, connected with the Mānvas (viz., of Tārā and Mandodarī, with Rāma's approval); and one reference to a possibility of a similar 'mixed' case amongst the Mānvas themselves,—as between Sītā-Vaidehī (or-Kauśalyā) and Lakṣmaṇa (or Bharata), in the event of Rāma's death.[1]

With this group may be placed the case of Gautama[2] (Āṅgirasa), who married a 'dasyu widow (bestowed on him by a 'dasyu' chief), settled amongst her people, and had many sinful children by her. The personal and topographical details in the story[3] show that it is evidently another version—a sarcastic and a Western anti-Āṅgirasa one—of the famous tradition of Dīrghatamas' adventures in the eastern countries. This 'dasyu' widow may or may not be the same as the 'Śūdrā' Uśij or Auśīnarī of the better-known versions; in fact Dīrghatamas took to wife a number of such women from Vali's harem or capital, by whom also he had numerous children. If identical, the 'dasyu' woman of the former version need not be taken as a 'widow,' but rather as 'one separated from (or kept separate by) her husband,'—for 'bhartrā virahitā' can mean both; and the latter meaning would suit the case of the transferred Auśīnarī quite well. In any case the Gautama-Āṅgirasa Dīrghatamas (41) had a wife who was either a 'full' widow or a clear 'equivalent,' or had two wives of each description.

[1] Vide ante.

[2] Mbh. § 658b (Kṛtaghnop. °): XII, 168-73.

[3] E.g. the 'dasyu' chief=the Anava Vali (often confounded with the Daitya Vali) ruling over non-Ailas; the great Rākṣasa city of Meruvraja=Girivraja (once the city of the Rāk.° Ṛṣabha, acc. to Mbh.): the "neighbouring 'Baka' king on the Ganges" agrees with the topography and Epic tradn.; the benefactions of the patron goddess Surabhi of Meruvraja agrees with the story of Surabhi's grace on the prolific Gautama at Girivraja; the sinful sons of Gautama are the disdained 'Kṛṣṇāṅga' (or Kuṣmāṇḍa) Gautamas of Girivraja in the usual versions; this, and the award of hell to Gautama, show that the version arose with a group hostile to Āṅgirasa pretensions,—and Nārada (the narrator), being apparently a Pārameṣṭhina-Pāñcāla, may well have represented such a group and tradition.

Amongst the early Ailas, the case of Purūravas (3) who rescued the abducted Urvaśī, and married her,[1] and the statement in the brāhmaṇicised tale of 'Indra-vijaya' that Nahuṣa courted the queen of 'Indra' after expelling and succeeding him, and was on the point of having her as his wife,[2]—are the only indications of an acquaintance with 'punarbhū'-or 'anyapūrva'-marriages in that age. Later on, however, Ajamīḍha (53) seems to have had a 'punarbhū' wife, Dhūminī, from whom the main Paurava line was descended.[3]

Amongst the later Ailas,—Yādavas and Pauravas,—more definite and frequent references are found. Some of the earlier Yādava cases are also Mānva cases, as noted above; the clearest of them being that of the proposed re-marriage of Damayantī-Vaidarbhī (51, or 42?). The next indications are much later, belonging to the period just before the Bhārata battle. The '16,000 wives'[4] of Kṛṣṇa (94) belonged originally to Naraka-Bhauma of Prāgjyotiṣa, having been his entire select harem, which Kṛṣṇa captured and transferred[5] to Dvārāvatī for himself, after slaying Naraka. As already noted, such harem transfers were not rare in this or subsequent ages, and it necessarily involved 'equivalents' of widow-marriages. Thus Vātsyāyana's Sūtra clearly records *traditional* dynastic customs when it classifies[6] the king's 'antaḥpurāṇi,' in order of *court precedence*, as the 'devīs,' being his own normally wedded and principal wives,—the '*punarbhūs*,' evidently the widows of the predecessor and of vanquished kings,—and the courtezans, both 'ābhyantarikā' (i.e., those taken into the ranks of the 'zenānā' wives), as well as 'nāṭakīyā' (i.e., the court actresses and dancing girls).[7] Arjuna's (94) settlement of Vajra (97) and Sātyaki and Kṛtavarman's (grand- or great-grand-) sons, with the remnants of the Yādava seraglios,[1] must have involved similar 'punarbhū' marriages. What is indicated for groups in the above cases, is illustrated for individuals, in the story of Pradyumna and Mayavatī, the widow of Śambara.[2]

---

[1] Mat. 24, 23 ff., Purūravas' reputed grandfather Soma's appropriation of his priest's wife Tārā, and his nine other similar connections, may be taken as earlier instances in the Aila group; *vide* :—Brahmāṇḍa : III, 65, 22-44; Matsya : 23, 23-47 and 24, 1-9; Viṣṇu : IV, 6, 5-19; Brahma : IX; Padma : V, 12, 33-59; Hariv. 25, 1309 ff; Vāyu : 90, 28 ff; etc.

[2] Mbh. V, 11—15.

[3] Cf. Vāyu : 99, 206-9; Matsya : 50, 17-19; etc.; and note 6, pp. 77—78.

[4] The figures of course are not to be taken literally. The Jātaka tradition knows of other ancient kings with '16,000' wives (vide infra sec. *re* polygamy).

[5] Not improbable as Kṛṣṇa may have easily penetrated into N. E. Bengal after Magadha had been subjugated by Jarāsandha's fall. In later history cf. the parallel of Gurjara kings carrying off 'royal umbrellas' from Gauda (8th and 9th cent. A.D.).

[6] Vāts. Kā. Sūt. IV, 2, 55-64.

[7] Separate private chambers and gathering halls are assigned in that Sūtra for the wives of each class. It is to be noted that elsewhere Vāts. Kā. Sūt. recognizes 'punarbhū' wives as normal and frequent, apart from court circles (e.g. IV, 2, 31—44).

Amongst the later Pauravas all such references belong to the period immediately before the Bhārata battle, and are comparatively clearer :—Kārta-Ugrāyudha (Dvimīḍha-Pāñcāla) (90/91) wanted the widowed Satyavatī-Vāsavī (Pauravī) to be his wife,[3] within a few days of Śantanu's death, and sent a messenger to Bhīṣma demanding his step-mother; as Bhīṣma did not agree to such an ill-timed and ill-worded demand, Ugrāyudha invaded Hāstinapura to enforce it, but was killed in battle. It is to be noted that the main objection of Bhīṣma was that the proposal was haughty and inconsiderate, the funeral ceremonies of Śantanu being yet unperformed; nothing is said regarding the inadmissibility of the widow-remarriage involved; and if Ugrāyudha had won the battle, he would have married Satyavatī quite in accordance with the royal custom[4] of having 'punarbhū' wives.[5] Satyavatī's marriage with Śantanu, was also an equivalent 'anyapūrvā' one, she having borne a son to 'Parāśara' (Vāśiṣṭha) before that; and though the fact may not have been known to

---

[1] Mbh. XVI, 7, 230-'53.

[2] Br. 200—201; Hariv. 163—168.
Other indications may be found in the cases of : (1) Rukminī, who being first betrothed to Śiśupāla was almost an 'anyapūrvā'; and Śiśupāla too would gladly have taken her as wife if he could, after her marriage with Kṛṣna. (2) Bhānumatī, who was violated by Nikumbha of Ṣaṭpura, and lived with him for a long time, and was after her rescue married to Sahadeva-Pāṇḍava. (3) Bhadrā-Vaiśāli, who may either have been a 'shared' wife of Vasudeva, the Kāruṣa king, and Śiśupāla, or a widow of one of the latter two, finally taken into the seraglio of Vasudeva.

[3] Hariv. 20, 1085—1112; she was also sought in marriage by Asita *after* her amour with Parāśara, apparently while still living with him : Mbh. I, 100. 4045.
Ajamīḍha.

[4] Cf. the 'punarbhū' wife of Ugrāyudha's ancestor

[5] That this practice was known to the Pāñcālas is also proved by the 'Jātaka' statement that Draupadī's mother was the widow of the Kośala king, after whose defeat and slaughter she was during her pregnancy married by Draupadī's putative and step-father, and made his chief queen; other similar cases are known to the Jātaka tradition, referring to S. Pāñcāla (taken as= Kāśi) and Kośala, and to the Epic and post-Epic periods. In Pāñcāla, again, Mahācūlanī's queen married her brāhmaṇ paramour after her husband's murder,—which is parallelled by what Karṇa (in the Epic) says about the minister Mahākarṇi appropriating the queen of the expelled or slain Māgadha King Ambuvica. In a later period, nearer to Buddhism, a woman of Kośala prefers a brother's life to a husband's, as other husbands and children by them might be obtained afterwards (Cowell : Jātakas : I, 165).

Santanu, it was quietly accepted later on by the Kuru court; but it was unlikely that the brāhmaṇ Asita-Devala (Kāśyapa) did not know of it when he stood a candidate for Satyavatī's hand.[1] Very similar is the case of Kuntī-Saurī (Yādavī) (92/93), whose previous 'connection' also was apparently unknown to Pāṇḍu, but subsequently an open secret in all court circles. Satyavatī herself had no scruples regarding the permissibility of widow-remarriages: immediately after Vicitravīrya's death, she proposed that Bhīṣma (90/91) should marry the widows of her son, the Kośala (=Kāśi) princesses; Bhīṣma's non-compliance is amply explained by his famous pact, whereby he could not marry and have children who would inherit *his* claim; it is to be noted that this did not legally prevent him from accepting an invitation to 'niyoga' (which he probably did), for in that case it would not be *his* rights to the throne that would be passed on to the begotten son, but that of his 'putative' father; thus it becomes intelligible why Bhīṣma should have put forward the counter-proposal of 'niyoga' of the widows as better than their frank remarriage. While however Ambikā and Ambālikā could well have remarried, their elder sister Ambā is rejected by the Sālva king (Mārttikāvata-Yādava) after her forcible abduction by Bhīṣma, in spite of her assertions of innocence; it is said that Sālva did not like the idea of marrying an 'anapūrvā'[2]; but that is not enough of an explanation in view of contemporary dynastic practices; 'dread of Bhīṣma,' so often emphasised in the Ambā story, together with some amount of vanity, was plainly the greater part of the reason. As noted already, it is probable that, as amongst the Yādavas, there were occasional harem-transferences amongst the Pauravas also,[3] and it seems likely that some of the Dhārtarāṣṭra widows (94/95) were taken into the Pāṇḍava seraglios as the 'punarbhū' wives of the five joint kings.[4]

As noted above, the earlier references to widow-burning belong to the Mānva group:—Thus the Vaiśālī king Khanitra's (20, or several steps later) three devoted wives are said to have died along with their husband, with whom they had retired to the forest in old age; how they died is made clear by the subsequent case of the retired Vaiśālī King Nariṣyanta (41) and his wife Indrasenā who ascended the funeral pyre of her husband when he was murdered by a Yādava king, Vapuṣmat, in his forest retreat. Such 'sahamaraṇa' was not however fully customary in this family,—for a few steps above, Vīrā, the queen of Karandhama (38), continued in her austerities for several years after her husband's death in their forest hermitage (within a 'brāhmaṇ' settlement).[1] In the Aikṣvāka family[2] there is the well-known instance of Bāhu's (39) Yādavī queen, who was on the point of committing 'suttee,' but was dissuaded by her Bhārgava benefactor, on the ground of her pregnancy and prospect of the birth of an auspicious son.[3]

---

[1] Mbh. I. 100. 4045.

[2] Mbh. V, 175, 5979 ff.

[3] Cf. the proposed transference of Vicitravīrya's wives to Bhīṣma; or what 'Urvaśī' says about the ancient custom of Puru princes approaching a predecessor's wife; the case of Pratīpa (89), Gaṅgā-Bhāgīrathī and Santanu, may have been really a case of such transference; cf. the parallel Yādava instance of Jyāmagha (38), the captured princess, and Vidarbha, where also there is the same probability. Cf. Cowell, Jāt. VI, 133, for a clear case of harem transference from the Māgadha King Arindama to his son Dīrgha (prob. the same as the contemp. of Pāṇḍu, in Mbh. I, 113, 4451).

[4] The palace establishments of the Dhārta.° princes were transferred to them after the battle.

Under this group also falls the case of Reṇukā-Prāsenajitī[4] (32), an Aikṣvāka princes married to Jamadagni-Bhārgava (daughter's son of another Aikṣvāka princess), who wanted to immolate herself on the funeral pyre of her husband after his slaughter by the Haihayas, but was prevented by the Bhārgava elders.[5] It is noteworthy that no 'brāhmaṇ' case of 'suttee' is known to tradition, and this is quite in keeping with the difference between 'brāhmaṇ' and 'kṣatriya' social life in general. The case of Reṇukā cannot be taken as a 'brāhmaṇical' one, as she is herself a kṣatriya princess married into a mixed 'brahma-kṣatra' family with pronounced kṣatriya traits. The only 'brāhmaṇ' instance probable is that of the Āṅgirasī[6] in the Kalmāṣapāda story (54); but the episode seems to have been either wholly invented, or to have been subsequently used, to explain Madayantī's 'niyoga,' and naturally modelled on the Pāṇḍu story; so that it is the self-immolation of Mādrī that is echoed in what is said about the Āṅgirasī. Even if this be a genuine case, the Mānva connection is obvious.

Long after these Mānva and connected cases, we have several others amongst the later Yādavas and Pauravas :—

On Pāṇḍu's (93) death, Kuntī (Yādavī) wanted to be burnt with him, being the elder queen; but Mādrī dissuaded her, showing the fitness of *her* following the dead husband, and ascended the funeral pyre. But that is only one version[1]: the other and more probable version[2] (because it is interwoven with details of subsequent events) shows that Mādrī simply died a tragic death soon after Pāṇḍu, apparently from grief and shock, and the two *unburnt* bodies were (on the 17th day after Pāṇḍu's demise) brought down from the hills to the Kuru capital, where they were burnt together with royal honours and ceremonials: so that there was no case of widow-burning here,—only a touching synchronous death. But the point remains that both the queens wanted to commit 'suttee' actually, and there was no dissuasion from that purpose.

---

[1] These details are in Mārk.° Pur.° 113-136.

[2] If the Vyuṣitāśva of Kuntī's story is the Aikṣvāka Vyuṣitāśva, then the case of Bhadrā-Kākṣivatī may be placed here, as one of prevented 'suttee' for the sake of progeny.

[3] Bḍ. III, 63, 126-33; Vā. 88, 120-39; Br. 8, 29-46; Viṣ. IV, 3, 15-18; etc.

[4] Bḍ. III, 30, 34-50; etc.

[5] It is rather striking that in both these cases of dissuasion it is a Bhārgava who dissuades.

[6] Mbh. I, 182; cf. Viṣ. IV, 4, 19-38; etc.

The curious statement, that after the slaughter of 'Kīcaka' his kinsmen obtained the permission of his brother-in-law Virāṭa (Matsya-Paurava) (93) to force Draupadī (the Sairandhrī) to mount the funeral pyre of 'Kīcaka' and be burnt with his body,[3] shows that amongst the Kīcakas there was a practice of burning the favourite woman of a dead chieftain along with him. Who these Kīcakas were is not very clear; they are not derived from any Aila or Mānva family by tradition; they may have been Kīkaṭas; at any rate they were closely connected with the Matsyas and Trigartas, and had intermarried with the former; and the Matsya king, having sanctioned the proposal regarding an attendant of his own court, must have been fully aware of such a practice.

It is remarkable that in all the detailed account of the general destruction of the Kurus (and other combatants) in the Bhārata war, there is not a single instance of 'suttee.'[4] There are however several 'equivalent' cases,—those of suicide by drowning, in connection with the tragic episode of 'Putradarśana'; a number of Kuru (and Pāṇḍava-Pāñcāla) widows (95) plunged into the Ganges, with the permission of Vyāsa, to follow and rejoin their dead husbands, of whom they had had a night-long spiritual vision through the grace of that sage.[5] Ulūpī (94) later on followed apparently the same course, when she 'entered the waters of the Ganges,' on the 'mahāprasthāna' of her husband Arjuna, etc.,—tantamount to death to the world.[1] But that phrase may also mean that (like another wife of Arjuna) she returned by river to her Nāga father's riparian principality on the Upper Ganges. The other Pāṇḍava wives left behind did not think of any rash steps: Citrāṅgadā repaired to her son's kingdom, and Subhadrā and the rest remained with Parikṣit.

---

[1] Mbh. I, 125.

[2] Mbh. I, 126-27.

[3] Mbh. IV, 23.

[4] Thus women go out of the city into the battlefield to bury their dead husbands and relatives: there is no 'sahamaraṇa': XI, 11, 298; cf. 1 and 9.

[5] Mbh. XV, 31-33.

The later Yādava cases are the clearest of all, strikingly similar to the medieval Rājput (Indo-Scythic) 'Jauhars' of the same regions and the alleged ancient Scythic custom. This may have something to do with the early close connection between the Haihaya-Tālajaṅghas (Yādavas) and the Śakas,[2] etc., jointly with whom they raided and spread all over N. India. The Śakas and kindred tribes were indeed already settling in (the submontane) part of the kingdoms of Kānyakubja and Kośala, having intimate political relations with the Kuśika-Ailas and the Vāśiṣṭhas[3],; and they seem to have settled in and dominated Kośala for a long time before Sagara (41) (for about 18 generations), forcing some of its ruling families to branch off in different directions.[4] It is remarkable that the Mānva instances of widow-burning should be confined precisely to this period, and to those branches of the Mānva stock that still clung to Kośala and the adjacent Vaiśālī in spite of Śaka (and Haihaya) domination. The obvious inference is that under pressure of the circumstances, or as a result of prolonged Śaka influence, the Mānvas (of whom the Śakas were an early branch according to tradition) often adopted the (kindred) Scythic practice: thus it is that no further cases are found amongst them *after* this period. On the other hand, the Śakas, etc., in the latter part of their predatory career became definitely associated with the Haihaya-Yādavas, and after Sagara's time apparently became merged in their numerous ranks,[1] being humiliated and expelled by that king. This would explain the few earlier Yādava-Mānva cases of this period, and also the subsequent reappearance[2] of Scythic-like 'group' 'suttees' amongst the later Yādavas in an age of disasters.

---

[1] Mbh. XVII, 1.

[2] *Re* the Śakas in Purāṇic tradn., vide end of sec. *re* sister-marriage.

[3] Kuśika-Kuśāśva (29) lived amongst the Śakas, probably after Kānyakubja had been overthrown for the first time by Yādava-Haihayas between Śaśavindu and Durdama's times (or by the Śakas themselves),—and it was with their support that he recovered the throne; a few steps later, his descendant Viśvāmitra Viśvaratha (32) was discomfited by 'Vaśiṣṭha's' Śaka allies

[4] It is noteworthy that in about the same time (22-34) as the Yādava-Haihaya and Śaka invasions (20-41), all the noted Aikṣvāka groups of kings are located in regions other than Ayodhyā: e.g. Purukutsa (22) migrates to Mālwā in the S. W. (which suggests that the powerful Druhyus, counting Śakas, etc., amongst them, whom Māndhātṛ (21) had molested, now invaded Kośala in retaliation) where his and his brothers' descendants continued to have political relations; Haryaśva, whose wife was the notorious Mādhavī, seems to have migrated into the Śūrasena Yādava country also, and his family became merged into the Yādava groups; while Triśaṅku's family is located in the Kīkaṭa country with definite topographical details. (It may well be that Triśaṅku and Viśvāmitra's exiles were partly due to some Śaka-Vāsiṣṭha alliance).

These 'group suttees' occured, it is said, 36 years[3] after the Bhārata battle, when the confederate Yādava clans of Dvārāvatī perished ingloriously in internecine strife; urged by Satyā-Sātrājitī, Kṛṣṇa recklessly completed the destruction, and then met with his death apparently in the course of a Niṣāda raid on the helpless city; old Vasudeva (93), died of grief; thereupon the 4 favourite wives of Vasudeva, Rohiṇī-Pauravī (of Vāhlīka),[4] Bhadrā-Vaiśālī, Devakī and Madirā, mounted his funeral pyre[5]; Rukmiṇī and some other wives of Kṛṣṇa (94) also did the same,[6] but others like Satyā-Sātrājitī, etc., retired to the Himālayan hermitage of Kalāpagrāma (as did the widows of Akrūra).[7] It seems however that Rukmiṇī, etc., did not forthwith ascend the actual funeral pyre of Kṛṣṇa but entered the fire several days afterwards,[8]—probably when the Yādava cavalcade hurrying to Indraprastha was surprised by the Ābhīras.

---

[1] Just as various other Mānva sections were assimilated by the Yādavas from time to time.

[2] This would involve a supposition that the Yādavas preserved traces of Scythic admixture for about 600 years, which is not improbable as that admixture itself took about 250 years; besides the Yādavas had subsequent connections also with the Drhuyus and other Western peoples, to whom the Śakas are traditionally traced; thus there was another Śaka-Yavana invasion of Mathurā, from the Himālayan regions in the time of Kṛṣṇa; and Kṛṣṇa's exploits brought him in touch with the Western nations specially (as the Mbh. says).

[3] Prob. only 6 years.

[4] It is noteworthy that both Rohiṇī and Mādrī are princesses of the Vāhlīka dynasty, a N. W. offshoot from the Kurus of Hāstinapura, and both had Yādava co-wives, whose example they apparently followed.

[5] Mbh. XVI, 7.

[6] Ibid. Rukmiṇī-Vaidarbhī, Jāmbavatī-Kapindraputrī (cf. XIII, 629), Śaibyā, Gāndhārī, and Haimavatī,—the last three hailing from the N. W.

[7] Ibid; cf. retirement of Kuru ladies: Mbh. XV, 15-18.

[8] Ibid.

So far only the positive references to widow-burning have been dealt with; but it is to be noted that there are many more instances in traditional accounts, where details of the demise of kings (and brāhmaṇs) are given, but where either nothing is said about the 'sahamaraṇa' of their widows, or they are plainly stated to have lived on normally: e.g., in the cases of Daśaratha and Vṛhadvala amongst Aikṣvākas,—of Karandhama amongst Vaiśāleyas,—of Karṇa amongst E. Ānavas,—of Bharata, Śantanu, Vicitravīrya, the Dhārtarāṣṭras, Duḥśalā, Abhimanyu, etc., amongst Pauravas,—of Ugrasena, Kaṃsa, Akrūra, etc., amongst Yādavas,—or of Auddālakī-Sujātā and Śaktṛ's wife Adṛśyantī, amongst Āṅgirasas and Vāśiṣṭhas. Thus no general custom of 'sahamaraṇa' is proved for any particular group, though in some of these groups more cases can be discovered than in others, owing to circumstances and facts explained above.

VI.

It is supposed by some Vedic scholars that polygamy was dying out in the 'Ṛgvedic' period, yielding place to monogamy.[1] The Ṛgvedic evidence *by itself*, however, can be made to prove either this or the opposite theory. The correct interpretation of that evidence, therefore, must depend on the *historical* data supplied by the traditional accounts. These make it plain that polygamy never died out in any part of the Vedic age, but existed before it, during it, and after it; only there were several well-marked periods and groups in which the practice was more in evidence than in the others, owing to circumstances not unintelligible; and at the same time there were other groups and periods more or less characterized by monogamistic ideals. On the whole, however, polygamy was associated with 'brāhmaṇ' influence, dynastic expansion, or frequent wars, and was on the increase towards the close of the Vedic age; while monogamistic tendencies were more apparent amongst the non-brāhmanic, or minor, or temporarily unimportant principalities.

Quite naturally, a number of the cases of polygamy noticed in tradition are also those of concubinage, or possession of slave-girls, or connection with courtesans, or general laxity in sexual morals. About these instances also, the same remarks hold good, regarding their developing conditions and distribution in groups and periods.

Polygamy is ascribed to some of the kings of the pre-Aila and pre-Mānva dynasties.[2] Whatever may be the value of these semi-legendary references, that of the uniform ascription of 'group' polygamy to the 'prajāpatis' for a few generations immediately before the rise of the Mānva and Aila dynasties,[3] is clearer: these latter cases seem to belong to the first stages of Mānva and Aila race-settlements, when wholesale transferences of the daughters of the one clan[1] (probably conquered) to the possession of the other horde-leaders ('prajāpatis') would be natural.

---

[1] Vide ante *re* Vedic evidence on this point.

[2] E.g. Uttānapāda had two wives Sunīti and Suruci, mothers of the famous Dhruva and Uttama respectively ('Svāyambhuva' vaṃśa, in almost all Purāṇas). The Mārk.° Pur.° ascribes 4 wives (1 chief and 2 companions + 1 temporary) to 'Svarociṣa' (f. of 'Svārociṣa' Manu), whose polygamy is denounced, so that he finally becomes an ascetic (Mārk.° Pur.° 61-68). The same Pur.° ascribes six royal wives to King Durgama of Priyavrata's line (f. of 'Raivata' Manu) (ibid. 75); and Svarāṣṭra (f. of 'Tāmasa, Manu) also is said to have had other wives besides the chief queen (ibid. 74). The first two cases are located in the N. Himālayas; the 3rd in the S. W. (Ānarta, Surāṣṭra, etc.), and the 4th on the Vipāśā (N. W.); these were amongst the regions occupied by the Mānvas and pre-Mānvas before Aila expansion.

[3] In all Pur.°, with more or less details. It seems probable that 'rājan,' 'manu,' 'prajāpati' or 'indra' (as known to Pur.° tradn.), were different types of rulers, with distinguishable features and periods of flourishing.

In the very next stage, polygamy is found continued amongst the early Mānvas, but only rarely and gradually amongst the early Ailas. Manu (1) had ten wives according to brāhmaṇic tradition[2]; that of the Epic and Purāṇas does not mention it, except once, but ascribes to him as many, or many more sons.[3] Ikṣvāku[4] (2) and Vikukṣi[5] (3) had very large progenies, who were settled in several groups in Uttarāpatha and Dakṣiṇāpatha, and in the N. Himālayan and submontane regions, respectively: their polygamy is obvious. So is that of Vṛhadaśva (11) and Kuvalāśva (12), to each or one of whom from 100 to 21,000 (!) sons are ascribed[6]; and of Yauvanāśvi-Māndhatṛ (21), who had (besides four noted children) 50 daughters,[7] all of whom he bestowed on a Kāṇva (Paurava) ṛṣi, Sobhari (who had 150 sons by them),[8]—just as three or four steps above, Māndhātṛ's mother's ancestor Raudrāśva-Paurava (17) had given away all his ten daughters to another opulent ṛṣi, the Ātreyā Prabhākara (from whom the

---

[1] E.g. the daughters of Dakṣa, of whom 13 were given to Kaśyapa, 27 to Soma, etc. Instead of being taken as obscure cosmogonic myths, this common Purāṇic account may be taken as stating a tradition that when the Pṛthuite dynasty of Dakṣa was supplanted by Mānvas and Ailas, the women of the former royal family passed into the possession of the Mānva and Aila leaders (typified by 'Kaśyapa' and 'Soma.')

[2] Mait. Saṃ. I, 5, 8; cf. Mbh. XII, 13596.

[3] At the commencement of all Solar dynastic lists; the number varies bet. 9 and 10, acc. as 'Ila' is included or not; one version gives 50 more sons to Manu, who perished in dissensions: Mbh. I, 75.

[4] 2+50+48=100 sons: Vāyu: 88, 8-11. 20-24; Brahma: 7, 45-8, 51; etc.; and Mbh. XIII, 2, 88; also Matsya: 12, and Padma: V, 8 (102 sons); etc.

[5] 114 (in the S.) + 15 (in the N.)=129 sons: Matsya: 12, 26-8; Padma: V, 8, 130-3; etc.

[6] Vāyu: 88, 30-60; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 63, 29-62; cf. Mbh. III, 202 (beg.) and 204 (beg.); also Brahma: 7, 60-86; Hariv. 11, 674-5 and 696 ff.; cf. Viṣṇu: IV, 2, 13.

[7] Viṣṇu: IV, 2, 19—3, 3; Bhāg: IX. 6, 38-55; Padma: VI, 232, 16. 33-82; Garuḍa: I, 138, 23; cf. Bṛhadd. VI, 50-7.

[8] The treatment of the story is no doubt brāhmaṇical; but it is to be noted that it occurs in the midst of a Kṣatriya account of a Mānva dynasty which was closely connected with brāhmaṇs; the precedents of polygamy in the cases of Raudrāśva (17) (where also there is the same brāhmaṇ connection) and Śaśavindu (20) both related to Māndhātṛ, and the succeeding case noted here, make the tradition highly probable. This does not clash with Rv. evidence, for the Sobhari connected with the Bharatas may very well have been a different one from the Sobhari connected with the 'Mānva' Paurukutsas, and the patronymics Daurgaha and Gairikṣita do not necessarily make the bearer of it a different person, but may have been simply additional and qualificatory, as in several other cases.

Svastyâtreya families thus descended).[1] It seems possible, however, that the bestowal of those fifty maidens was regarded as a gift of slave-girls by that ṛṣi[2]; this would then indicate that these 'daughters' of Māndhātṛ were born of captive or slave-girls acquired in the course of his wide conquests.[3] A sister of a 'Yuvanāśva' (apparently some near descendant of Purukutsa who had Nāga connections)[4] had five daughters by a Nāga king Dhūmravarṇa of the S. W. littoral (or adjacent islands), who were all given in marriage to the already married son of Haryaśva-Aikṣvāka (27), who was ousted from Ayodhyā and settled amongst the Yādavas of the S. W.[5]

On the other hand, amongst the early Ailas the first probable case of polygamy is that of Nahuṣa (5), who (besides his sister-wife Virajā)[6] is said to have coveted ineffectually the queen of an 'Indra' whom he displaced, and otherwise assumed a sensual turn of mind after his rise to great power[6]; but this does not prove a practice of polygamy. With Yayāti (6), however, it is polygamy distinctly, connected with concubinage and relations with slave-girls.[7] Yayāti had no harem before his Bhārgava marriage; for he was then single, and had subsequently to build special apartments in his palace for Śarmiṣṭhā and her 1,000 or 2,000 (!) companions and attendant slave-girls. He obtained Śarmiṣṭhā and three other maidens by virtue of his marriage with Devayānī, whose bondswomen they had become as a result of the Bhārgava priestly domination over Vṛṣaparvan's family. Śarmiṣṭhā established her status (and thereby that of the rest of her party also) as Yayāti's wife by explaining to him that a bride's female companions and slave-girls were also lawful wives by custom, being bound to her and being given away at the same time; she reminded him that she was thus given away by Vṛṣaparvan, who is elsewhere stated to have entertained Yayāti at his court on the occasion of his marriage.[1] From these details it would at first seem as if Yayāti's polygamy was derived as much from the Bhārgavas as from the 'Dānavas'; but even before Yayāti Āyu had married a 'Dānava' princess without any indication of similar circumstances[2]; so also later on Puru, Dhundhu and Duṣyanta, all sons of 'Dānava' mothers,[3] were either not associated with polygamy, or where so, it is not directly attributable to the 'Dānava' source[4]; no instance of polygamy is found amongst these earlier (and real) Dānavas, whereas several are recorded about the early Bhṛgus (viz., the 'Bhṛgu' who married Dakṣa's daughters,[5] Cyavāna,[6] and Śukra himself)[7]; and in this particular instance the Dānava kingdom and dynasty was completely dominated by the Bhṛgu priest. It is also significant that it is with Yayāti that 'brāhmaṇ' influence first effects a real entry[8] into the Aila group, after several prominent attempts and conflicts.[9] His son Puru (7) may possibly have had two wives[10]—but no clear case of polygamy occurs again amidst the early Ailas (Pauravas or Yādavas) till the time of Raudrāśva (17)[11] and Śaśavindu (20), with both of whom

---

[1] Particulars in Brahma: 13, 6-14; Hariv. 31, 1661-8; Vāyu: 99, 121 ff.

[2] Rv. VIII, 19, 36, is usually so interpreted, though 'Vadhū' there may as well have the sense of 'wedded' wives or brides (being carried home).

[3] As in the case of his father-in-law Śaśavindu; vide infra.

[4] Viṣṇu: LV, 3, 6-12; this Yuvanāśva may be Ambarīṣa's descendant (23 ?).

[5] Harivaṃśa: 94-95, 5142-5206 (Vikadru's account of Yādava expansion, told to Kṛṣṇa).

[6] Vide ante.

[7] Apart from his 2 chief queens (in all Purāṇas: e.g. Vāyu: 93, 28 ff.; Brahma: 12, 22 ff.; Hariv. 30, 1601 ff.; Matsya: 25, 6; 27-32; Viṣṇu: IV, 10, 1, etc.) and a host of concubines (cf. Mbh. I, 80-82), tradition credits him with further amours in old age, e.g. with Viśvācī (Viṣṇu: IV, 10, 6-8; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 68-70), or Aśrūvindumatī-Ratiputrī (Padma: I, 76-81), for whose sake he wanted to kill those two queens and quarrelled with his sons (prob. for the second time). (Note.—'Ratiputrī' seems to be a modification of 'Raji-putrī' which was not understood; 'Raji' was the 'Indra' in Nahuṣa's time, and he may well have used his daughter in ruining his rival and brother's son of a neighbouring principality; Nahuṣa's coveting 'Indra's' queen thus would mean simply his overthrowing his brother Raji and trying to appropriate his wife,—quite a 'real' event to be recorded in tradition and to be referred to by Śalya by way of an example to Yudhiṣṭhira. 'Aśrūvindumatī' is not a likely proper name; but 'Vindumatī is; so the original phrase would seem to have been 'agrū Vindumatī Raji-putrī' or 'the unmarried daughter of Raji named Vindumatī.')

---

[1] For the above details, vide Mbh. I, 78-83, and the Pur.° refs. above.

[2] In most Pur.°, e.g. Vāyu : 92, 1; etc.

[3] This generalization is made by the Mbh. and the Pur.° themselves in the genealogical portions. Dhundhu is called 'Danāyuṣā's' son; evidently referring to a similar parentage as in the three other Aila cases.

[4] For Duṣyanta's probable case, vide infra.

[5] In most Pur.° accounts of Dakṣa's progeny.

[6] Āruṣī : Mbh. I, 66, 2605 ff.; cf. III, 174, 65; Sukanyā : Mbh. III, 121, 10313; 122, 10320-44; 124, 10371 f.; IV, 21, 650-51; V, 116, 3970; Vā 86, 23; Bḍ. III, 61, 19; Pad. IV, 14, 49 f.; Rām. V, 24, 11; numerous other 'Kanīs,' and Vadhūs,' acc. to Rv. and Bra.° (for refs. vide *ante.*)

[7] Go (a sister) : in all Pur.° accounts of Pitṛ-vaṃśa; Jaynatī (d. of either Nahuṣa or Raji) : Vā. 97, 149-54; 98, 20; Bḍ. III, 72, 150-6; 73, 19; Mat. 47, 114-21. 186.

[8] He gets his 'victorious car' and wives from a Bhārgava brāhmaṇ, of whom he is afraid and who curses him, and then restores him to favour,—even sanctions the unusual succession of Puru, which is therefore accepted by the people. (His brother Yati became a 'muni' under Mānva influence apparently).

[9] E.g. in the time of Purūravas and Nahuṣa.

[10] One a Kauśalyā : Mbh. § 156 (Puruvaṃś.°) : I, 95, 3764; another, 'Pauṣṭī' : ibid. 94, 3495.

[11] As already noted, his 10 dtrs. were married to one ṛṣi Prabhākara : and he had 10 sons also besides those 10 dtrs. : Brahma : 13, 6-14; Hariv. 31, 1661 ff.; etc.

'brāhmaṇ' and Mānva connections are obvious. The victorious and conquering Śaśavindu is credited with such a large number of sons and wives,[1] that many of these latter must have been simply concubines or war-captives and slave-girls; such full-fledged polygamy cannot have cropped up suddenly, and if there was a previous history, it would be fully explained by the continued connection of the Bhṛgus (associated with Yayāti's polygamy) with Yadu's descendants[2]—who also quite early became rich and aggressive, and developed predatory tendencies.

In connection with this Haihaya-Yādava expansion, indeed, there is a marked frequency of polygamy in all the groups concerned with it: it seems as if with the Haihaya-Yādavas themselves, the polygamy was due to their raids, conquests and opulence,—while with the rest it was partly due to the tribal needs of struggling against numerous hordes for about two and a half centuries, and maintaining dynastic strength and continuity, and subsequently, to the flush of final victory over the invaders. The period covered by the Haihaya-Yādava troubles and the coeval cases of polygamy is that between the outer limits of Śaśavindu to Bharata (20—44) and the inner limits of Kṛtavīrya to Sagara (30—41).

The first Haihya-Yādava case of Śaśavindu (20) has already been noted[1]; his sons (21) also were evidently polygamous, being ascribed large progenies,[3]—which in fact is a main characteristic of the whole race; so were also Arjuna[4] (31), Tālajaṅgha[4] (34) and Vītihotra[5] (36), with their hundreds of sons; the patron-priest of the Kārtavīryas (31), Datta the Ātreya, was likewise a pōlygamist[6]; while Supratīka (39) and Durjya's (40) several wives[7] and their sons are named in story.[1] It thus seems probable that other famous Haihaya leaders, like Kṛtavīrya, Durdama, Bhadraśreṇya, etc., were also polygamous. This general Yādava tendency is illustrated in another fresh offshoot of the race in the same period : Jyāmagha[2] (38) had evidently a strong inclination towards polygamy, in spite of his precarious life of poverty and struggle, and once captured a maiden in a victorious raid,[3]—but could not marry her for fear of his queen, a Śaivyā (who had devotedly shared his exile) ; his son 'Vidarbha' (39/40) inherited this captive princess (probably not the only one), and had at least another wife[4] who bore him children.

---

[1] Brahma: 7, 94 (Vindumatī's 10,000 younger brothers); of. Brahmāṇḍa: III, 63, 70-71; Hariv. 12, 712-13; Vāyu: 95, 20 (100-hundred sons); but Matsya 44, 18 ff. (100 sons); Viṣṇu: IV, 12, 1-2 (1 lākh wives and 10 lākh sons); cf. Mbh. § 595 (Ṣoḍaśa-rājika): VII, 65, 2321 ff. (the 'sacrificing' king,—had 100,000 wives, each mother of 1,000 sons).

[2] Yadu was 'cursed' to live amongst his mother's people and follow them, (*i.e.* the Bhṛgus). There was also some maritime Nāga influence, for 'Yadu' or an early Yadu prince married 5 daughters of such a Nāga Sea-king over and above his other wife or wives, and these Nāgas, had inter-married with Mānvas:—Harīv. 94, 5193 ff.

[3] E.g. Vāyu: 95, 20; prob. this is referred to in 'Śāśavindavī prajāḥ' which filled the earth.

[4] Hariv. 34, 1890-1, and 1894; Vāyu: 94, 48-49 and 51, etc.

[5] He had as numerous a progeny as Tālajaṅgha,—the two groups being mentioned often together (e.g. Brahmāṇḍa: III, 47, 68 ff.); besides he had some descendants 'as a Bhārgava brāhmaṇ' subsequently. Acc. to Mbh. he had 10 wives and 100 sons, a moderate estimate.

[6] Mārk.° 17 and 18; Padma: II, 103.

[7] Each having two queens at the same time: Varāha: 10, 17-34 and 51-67.

The cases in the other group belong to the Aikṣvākas, Vaiśāleyas, Kānyakubjas, Kāśis (the restored), Pauravas and E. Ānavas, with connected Āṅgirasas,—most of whom were affected by the Haihaya movement. Amongst the Aikṣvākas of this time Triśaṅku (32) had at least 2 or 3 distinct wives [viz., Satyarathā of Kekaya[5] (mother of Hariścandra), the captured wife of 'Vidarbha'[6] (mother of Viṣṇuvṛddha), and of 'a citizen'][7], and his 'harem'[8] is said to have been under 'Vaśiṣṭha's' control during his exile.[9] Later on Bāhu (39) has also at least two wives, hostile to one another[10]; so again, his son Sagara (40/41), who may have had many more wives than two,[1] if there is any basis for his '60,000' sons[2]; this is not improbable, as the chief wives of these two princes were taken from (branch) Yādava families,[3] where concubinage was not rare; besides the very circumstances of struggle with the Haihayas and victory over them would induce similar polygamy by reaction,—and by this time the Bhārgava brāhmaṇs too had become associated with these Aikṣvāka princes.[4]

---

[1] It is to be noted that the particular naming in these two cases seems to be due to close connection with the Kāśis, within the sphere of regular bardic chronicles; the pure Yādava genealogics were often deficient in particulars, and it is only for the periods when the Yādavas were brought into intimate contact with North-Eastern life that details regarding their genealogies become fuller.

[2] This famous story is in all the major Purāṇas; Vāyu : 95; Brahmāṇḍa : III, 70; Matsya, 44; Brahma : 15; Viṣṇu : IV, 12; Hariv. 37.

[3] This points to one of the main sources of Yādava polygamy,—captives and slaves.

[4] Bhima, etc., were apparently her sons : Hariv. 37, 1989.

[5] Vāyu : 88, 116-17; Brahmāṇḍa : III, 63, 115-16; Hariv. : 13, 754; Brahma : 8.

[6] Vāyu : 88, 78-79; Brahmāṇḍa : III, 63, 77 ff.

[7] Brahma : 7, 98 ff.; Hariv. 12, 717-21.

[8] Brahma : 8, 1-23; Hariv. 13, 728.

[9] The fact that Triśaṅku was ousted from his kingdom after his capture of a Yādava ('Vidarbha') princess (cf. similar occasion for Haihaya-Vaiśāleya conflict), and that he made friends with the expelled Kānyakubjan Viśvāmitra in exile, and jointly with him struggled to some sort of power again, shows that these princes were combating the Haihayas who had allied with the Śakas and Vāśiṣṭhas, and were over-running the country from Kanauj to Oudh.

[10] Brahmāṇḍa : III, 63, 126-133; Brahma : 8, 29-46; and in corr. portions of Vāyu, Viṣṇu, etc.

The first (and apparently the last) Kānyakubjan (Aila) case of polygamy occurs with Viśvāmitra (32), referred to above, who had a number of sons by several wives already,[5] when he begat Aṣṭaka on a Paurava princess (Dṛṣadvatī or Mādhavī)[6] to succeed him in the apparently temporarily restored principality of Kānyakubja.[7] So also the only probable cases of polygamy in the Kāśi (Aila) line are those of the struggling Divodāsa-Bhaimarathi[8] (32 ?) and the victorious Alarka (43),[9] in the earlier and the latter parts of the same Haihaya period.—The only West Ānava instance known also fall within this period: Uśīnara[10] (bet. 26 and 32), the first of this Western branch, had four royal wives and sons by them before he begat Śivi on the same Paurava

---

[1] Matsya: 12, 39-42; Viṣṇu: IV, 3, 1-3; Brahma: 8, 63-72; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 63, 154-9; Hariv. 13, 760-14, 807, etc.; the names of the 2 wives are variously given, but they were from 2 sections of the Yādava groups of the S. W.

[2] Cf. refs. in n. 1; e.g. Brahma: 78, 3-11, etc.

[3] Vide refs. in n. 1 and n. 2. above.

[4] Vide same refs.; both Bāhu and Sagara were supported and befriended by Bhṛgus in their struggles; the Bhṛgus had become connected earlier with the Aikṣvākas immediately after their expulsion by Haihayas, in the time of Jamadagni (32). Three generations after Sagara, Bhagiratha is said to have given away 1 million damsels out of his stock to brahmaṇs. He was under Āṅgirasa influence, Kautsa taking his dtr. to wife: Mbh. VII, 2249 ff.; XIII, 6270.

[5] Cf. the Viśvāmitra genealogy: e.g., the sons Hiraṇyākṣa and Reṇu by Śālāvati, Gālava and Mudgala by another wife; etc.;—Brahma: 10, 55—67; Hariv. 27, 1460-62, etc.; one wife of V.° was supported by Triśaṅku.

[6] Mbh. Gālavacarita; Brahma: 13, 91-92; Hariv. 27, 1473; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 66, 75; Vāyu: 91, 99—103.

[7] Viśvāmitra had been expelled from it by Vāśiṣṭhas and Śakas, prob. joined with Haihayas; two generations later the kingdom finally succumbed.

[8] The probability is suggested by details in Gālavacarita, Mbh.

[9] So the details of Alarka's career in Mārk.° Pur.° (25 ff.) would suggest (cf. the common Purāṇic statement about 'the young and beautiful Alarka,' etc.).

[10] The details of his family are given in : Brahma: 13, 20-24 · Hariv. 31, 1674-79; Vāyu: 99, 17 ff.: Brahmāṇḍa: III, 74, 17-20; Matsya: 48, 15-21; Viṣṇu: IV, 18, 1 ff.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

princess mentioned above.[1] The emigration of the Ānavas from the Upper Doāb in two divisions towards Punjāb and Bengal may well have been due to the Haihaya (and Śaka) attacks of this time; and as in the case of the other minor affected dynasties, here too, Uśīnara's polygamy would be an indirect result of the impact.—The Eastern branch, getting settled beyond Vaiśālī, apparently escaped 'Haihaya' influences, but soon adopted the polygamy and lax harem-life of the Āṅgirasas and pre-existing Mānva-Saudyumna people (as already noted); thus the notorious cases of Vali[2] and the connected Āṅgirasas[3] also fall within the period in question, though forming a separate group owing to difference in developing conditions. The Vaiśāleya (Mānva) and Paurava ('Restoration') cases, however, are associated with both the sets of circumstances indicated above: on the one hand, the Haihaya invasions considerably affected them,—the Vaiśāleyas finally tiding over them after a struggle, and the Pauravas being almost crushed out at first but recovering after a long time; on the other, Vaiśālī was particularly an Āṅgirasa sphere, and the restored Pauravas were also completely brought under brāhmaṇ influence, first Kāśyapa (Kāṇva) and finally Āṅgirasa (Gautama-Bhāradvāja)[4]; thus in these cases, viz., of the Vaiśāleyas, Khanitra (20 or later); Avikṣit (39) and Marutta (40), and the Pauravas, Duṣyanta (43) and Bharata (44),—the effects of long and successful war with a polygamous race, as well as of Mānva-brāhmaṇ traditions and influence, have to be recognized. Of these princes Avikṣit (39)[1] was not content with the six wives who became his by self-choice, and developed a princely hobby of carrying off princesses holding their 'Svayaṃvara' and thus filling his harem (a peculiarly Yādava trait); and his capture of a Yādava princess led to a concerted attack (apparently a Haihaya invasion), which was resisted successfully by his father Karandhama. Marutta followed his father in having a number of royal wives[2]; besides he was a particularly rich prince, who rose to 'samrāt'-hood by wealth alone, while others had to fight for the rank.[3] Duṣyanta's polygamy is evident from such statements as that Śakuntalā consented to union with him only on the condition that *her* son should become the heir to the throne by preference, and that a number of women gathered to see him off as he set out for the hunt.[4] Bharata's three queens are well known in tradition.[5]

---

[1] The historical basis of the remarkable story of Dṛṣadvatī-Mādhavī seems to be an emergency entente between the Paurava, Kośala, Kāśi, Kānyakubja and W. Ānava princes in the face of a serious common danger from the Haihayas,—whereby their dynastic continuities and solidarity of alliance were assured by means of Mādhavī's special polyandry (cf. the case of Draupadī).

[2] Vali evidently had a large 'harem,' out of which 2 wives are separately mentioned, viz., Sudeṣṇā and Auśinarī; another distinct wife is probably indicated in the reference to a daughter of Vali, Subhadrā, being married to Avikṣit of Vaiśālī (in the genealogical account of that dynasty: Mārk.° Pur.° 113—136).

[3] Utathya (40) had probably two wives, Bhadrā and Mamatā (both adulterous and lax); cf. Mbh. § 772 (Utathya): XIII, 155, 7243 ff.; 'rūpeṇa paramā matā' is unsatisfactory; prob. 'Ma(ā)matā' is meant; 'bhadrā' would then be = 'Ma(ā)matā,' or an adj. Dīrghatamas was an ideal polygamist, having secured 'the grace of Surabhi' for that; besides refs. to his numerous progeny by a number of women (apparently in concubinage), distinct ref. is made to 3 wives, Pradveṣī, Auśinarī (transferred), and the 'dasyu' widow. His son or desc. Kākṣīvant was also a polygamist (marrying 11 wives or more). It is to be noted that other instances of polyamy are also known in the Āṅgirasa genealogies: e.g., Bharata, son of Śaṃyu, had 3 wives (being his sisters); prob. this last case also falls in the same period; so also Bhānu-Āṅgirasa had 3 wives: cf. Mbh. § 490 (Āṅgirasa)·III, 219, 14135-37; 221.

[4] For refs. leading to these conclusions vide Pargiter: AIHT, Chap XIX, e.g.

Notices of polygamy become very rare[6] in the period that follows. It is possible that it was now somewhat discouraged, after the Aila modification of Mānva brāhmaṇism,[7] begun by the Kauśikas (32) and furthered by the Bharatas (44); but the already noticed cases of polygamy amongst these two groups would rather show that in this respect they failed to change the earlier traditions much, at least at first. A more probable explanation of this rarity of instances is that this period, unlike the preceding one, was not marked by any great prolonged wars and invasions,[8] or tribal and social upheavals, and was a comparatively quiet one, during which the several dynasties sank into petty local existences.[9] The few known cases of polygamy for this interval of about 5 centuries (45—85) must therefore be regarded as sporadic recrudescences, sometimes associated with philo-brāhmaṇic princes and their priests. From the negative point of view, it is also to be noted that this was a period within which most of the monogamistic episodes of tradition fall,[1]—and also one wherein some of the most important and *properly*[2] Ṛgvedic personages flourished.[3] Of the instances referred to, three or four only can be assigned to definite steps in the dynastic scheme: Daśaratha (64) had at least three wives well known in tradition,—two of whom ('Kauśalyā' and Sumitrā) were ladies of his own family[4] and court (being respectively a Kośala princess and a daughter of the Vāśiṣṭha (or Āṅgirasa) priest Vāmadeva by a 'Karaṇa' wife),[5] and the third a Kekaya (W. Ānava) princess, who, coming from a court with other traditions,[6] created troubles by seeking to appropriate the king to herself and ignore his other wives and their children; Daśaratha enjoyed the patronage of Vāmadeva, a 'Vaśiṣṭha,' and the Kāśyapa Ṛṣyaśṛṅga of Aṅga (his son-in-law), to whose favour was due the birth of his sons (as in his friend's case).[7] Daśaratha's friend of Aṅga, and his namesake, distinguished from him as Lomapāda (64) (East Ānava), was also evidently the lord of a motley harem[8]; the story of his childlessness and invitation of the Kāśyapa brāhmaṇ Ṛṣyaśṛṅga into his harem for the sake of offspring is almost a replica of the episode of Vali and Dīrghatamas; it is clear that the same degenerate harem life and conditions continued in the E. Ānava group under Mānva-brāhmaṇ influence, only Lomapāda improved upon it by associating a large number of courtesans[9] intimately with the court[10] and even the princesses,[11]—the first *definite* instance of royal recognition and employment of prostitution.[12] Ajamīḍha (53) (restored Paurava) had at least three wives, of whom one, Dhūminī was a 'punurbhū,'—which probably implies that he had a 'punarbhū' section in his harem; the Paurava court at this time was dominated by the same Āṅgirasa-Bhāradvāja priesthood as in the days of Bhārata (44), as shown by Ajamīḍha's obtaining sons through the favour of a Bhāradvāja (clearly a cousin-priest).[1] In all these cases, Mānva-brāhmaṇ influence is very prominent. So also in the case of Saudāsa-Aikṣvāka[2] (54), where, although only wife, Madayantī, is named in the story, it appears he had a harem which was in 'Vaśiṣṭha's' charge during his exile (as with Triśaṅku); and this 'Vaśiṣṭha' had a hundred sons, and in addition was glad to obtain Saudāsa's queen.[3]

---

[1] The details of Vaiśālī marriage-relations are in Mārk.° Pur.° 113—136, and generally agree with well-established synchronisms.

[2] 7 wives and 18 sons; names and parentage of these princesses are given in all the cases.

[3] Mbh. II, 15 (where claims of previous great kings to 'samrāṭ'-ship are compared with Yudh.°'s).

[4] Mbh. (Śakuntalop.°): I, 73; 69.

[5] In all Pur.° genealogies.

[6] Only about 8 cases in 40 generations, compared with about 36 cases in the previous 44 generations.

[7] Vide Pargiter: AIHT. Chap. XXVI.

[8] The Ṛgvedic battles of this period were local, fought mainly by the petty Pāñcālas with neighbouring princes, with no great general results; what loomed large in the vision of the Ṛgvedic brāhmaṇs, was but an ordinary epoch from the wider standpoint of Kṣatriya tradition as a whole.

[9] Cf. the isolation of the Kosalas, Pāñcāla-Kurus, and Yādavas, for the greater part of this age (e.g. in the Rāmāyaṇic period).

---

[1] All connected with rather isolated and minor dynasties, and particularly with Vidarbha and West-Ānava principalities.

[2] Other 'Ṛgvedic' stages may be called the Mānva, Kauśika, and Early Bhārata (or Āṅgirasa) ones,—and this stage, the Later Bhārata or Pāñcāla.

[3] E.g. of the Sudāsa group.

[4] Vide ante.

[5] 'Sumitrā Vāmadevasya babhūva karaṇī-sutā.'

[6] For there was a monogamistic tendency amongst the W. Ānavas.

[7] Rām. I. 11. For Lomapāda: Vāyu: 99. 104, etc.

[8] Mbh. III, 110—113 (cf. XII, 234, 8609 and XIII, 137, 6269); Rām. I, 9 and 10; Viṣṇu: IV, 18, 3. Cf. also n. 7 above.

[9] Some of whom were hereditary.

[10] The ministers are conversant with them.

[11] Śāntā engages them at the command of the king; and Ṛṣyaśṛṅga, and his courtesans, are all kept within the inner apartments of the palace.

[12] Other probable instances are much earlier: vide infra.

[13] Nīlinī, Keśini, and Dhūminī: Brahma: 13. 81—82; Matsya: 49. 44; Hariv. 32, 1756 ff. and 20, 1055; etc.; in some accounts the number is four.

The other cases of this interval are not definitely assignable in time, and some of them might even belong to the next great period of polygamy (86-96). Thus Nīpa[4] (S. Pāñcāla) is credited with a large number of sons, and was thus polygamous; but he may be placed anywhere between steps no. 65 and 80; but no cases of polygamy being definitely ascribable to the early Pāñcālas, while they are to the later Pāñcālas, the lower limit would be better. So also with Somaka (N. Pāñcāla),[5] who had a large seraglio of about a hundred wives apparently, each of whom is said to have borne a son (100 altogether) after the sacrifice of the first child Jantu (who also is credited with 100 or 500 sons); Somaka and Jantu may be placed either immediately after Sudāsa and Sahadeva, at step 70 (and 71), or immediately before Pṛṣata, at step 90 (and 91),—but rather at the lower limit for the same reason. It is to be noted that though the Pāñcālas (offshoots of the restored Pauravas) had intimate brāhmaṇic relations from the beginning, yet it is only much later that they become "priest-ridden," as in the time of Somaka[1] or Brahmadatta[1], while in the earlier generations they themselves formed into fresh brāhmaṇ groups from time to time and kept up an equality with brāhmaṇs proper[2]; this apparently indicates the gradual and subsequent overpowering of the Aila element in the Pāñcāla group by the brāhmaṇ element; and with this appears polygamy, whereas in the earlier Pāñcāla period the only particulars available show a monogamy,—that of the devoted and heroic Indrasenā and Mudgala[3] (cir. 60). The Paurava-Māgadha cases of Vasu (who seems to have had 2 children by a different woman[4] from his queen Girikā), and of his son Vṛhadratha (who married the twin daughters of the Kāśi king)[5], might be placed either at steps 78—79, or at 89—91,—but preferably at the latter period, with the Epic accounts[6]; the non-Aila and eastern connections of these princes are evident from every detail of traditions about them.[7] The 'Vṛṣṇi' who married two wives[8], Gāndhārī and Mādrī, may be put anywhere between steps 67 and 90, but better at the latter, for Vṛṣṇi was quite a common name amongst the Yādavas, and Gāndhārīs and Mādrīs begin to figure in the Mahābhāratan age specially.[9] But the 'Bhajamāna' (Sāttvata-Yādava), who married the two daughters of Sṛñjaya (Pāñcāla)[10], can be fixed in time 67. It is possible that polygamy continued sporadically in the Yādava groups throughout the interval defined above; this would agree with the enormous expansion and multiplication of the Yādavas at the commencement of the next period, as disclosed by detailed traditional accounts[11];—the parallels between the earlier Haihaya-Yādava period and this Vṛṣṇi-Yādava one is significant.[1] The case of the Kākṣīvant, whom King Svanaya-Bhāvayavya (and his queen Romaśā) gave a number of princesses in marriage,[2] is hardly assignable to any particular step; he may be the same as Dīrghatamas' son (42), or a different person of the same line some 20 steps (65) or even 50 steps lower (91) ;[3] what is definite here is that all the *partis* concerned in the case were Āṅgirasas or allied to them, and the details have a distinct E. Ānava character.

---

[1] Vāyu : 99, 163—64; Matsya; 49, 45—46.

[2] Viṣṇu : IV, 4, 19—38; Mbh. I, 176—77 and 182; cf. also n. 3 below.

[3] Saudāsa's gr.-son Mūlaka earned the appellation of 'Nārī-kavaca' (Vāyu : 88, 178—79; Brahmāṇḍa : III, 63, 179; Viṣṇu : IV, 4, 38); though the story connecting him with Rāma-Bhārgava is anachronistic, the other statements about his living in the midst of many women may well have been authentic. Probably this is a very early instance of what was later on a common practice at courts,—employing foreign female guards (e.g. with the Sindhu kings temp. the Epic. or with the Mauryas of the 4th cent. B.C.); possibly also, the so-called 'naked' women surrounding Mūlaka are really 'nagnās' or 'mahā-nagnīs,' i.e., courtesans attendant on the king, which also is found in ancient Vedic (e.g. with the Vrātya king) and subsequent court life; in that case their importance would date from an earlier period than Lompāda's. Similar 'nārī-kavaca' stories are also told of Haihaya princes who were beaten back; so that 'female-guards and courtesan-attendants' may go back to a still earlier period,—being apparently derived from the S. W. : a significant point. It is to be noted that female body-guards of 'apsaras'—like grace (who were also concubines) are well known to the brāhmaṇ sacrificers in the Y. V.

[4] Matsya : 49, 52—53; Hariv. 20, 1060-62; etc.; it is however possible that the ascription of a large number of sons is general here, and simply means that particulars about the family are not known for the next few generations.

[5] Vāyu : 99, 203—5; Brahma : 13, 99—101; Mbh. (Jantūp.°) : III, 127—128; Matsya : 49; Viṣṇu : IV, 19, 18; Hariv. 32, 1793; all taken together, re Somaka and Jantu. (In Jantu's case also there is the same possibility as in Nīpa's, see above)

---

[1] Clear from all the stories told about them.

[2] As in the time of the 'Mudgala' groups of Kṣatriyan brāmaṇs.

[3] E.g. Rv. X, 102; Mbh. IV, 21, 651, (cf. III, 113, 10093); cf. Hariv. 32, 1781 (and other Pur.° also) for Indrasenā (Brahmiṣṭha must be taken as an epithet of Mudgala).

[4] Called Adrikā the 'fish-apsaras' in story; i.e. a woman of the neighbouring Matsya clan. The two names however mean the same thing, and might refer to the same person. Cf. Adrikā in Mbh. I, 63; and 123, 4817; and Girikā in I, 63, 2367.

[5] Mbh. § 275 (Rājasūyārambh.°); II, 17, 692; 18, 726. 729, etc.

[6] As in Mbh. I, 63 and II, 17—18, which do not show much contraction of genealogy.

[7] Cf. the stories in I, 63 and II, 17—18 (Mbh.); Suktimatī and Girivraja were in clearly non-Aila regions; though Yādava and Ānava branches had settled there long ago.

[8] 'Kroṣṭu' for 'Vṛṣṇi' is an error; the 2 wives are named in all Yādava genealogies; Brahma: 14, 1—2; 16, 9 ff.; Hariv. 35, 1906—8; Matsya: 45, 1—2; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 71, 18 ff.

[9] E.g. in connection with the marriage-relations of the Kauravas and Vṛṣṇis just before the Bhārata war.

[10] In all Yādava genealogies: Matsya: 44, 47—50; Viṣṇu: IV, 13, 2; Brahmāṇḍa: III, 71, 3—6; Hariv. 38, 1999—1003, Brahma: 15, 30—34.

[11] E.g. in Harivaṃśa,—the wars, conquests, and expeditions; cf. Mbh. II, where the political situation clearly shows the central fact of Yādava expansion and rise to power.

At about 8 or 9 steps above the Bhārata war, we come to a distinctly flourishing age of polygamy, illustrated in almost all the groups known to tradition; and during this century (which was also the close of the Ṛgvedic period), so full of personal details about great princes and connected brāhmaṇs, only two probable (and if definite, rather exceptional) cases of monogamy[4] are discoverable amidst the universal laxity of royal and priestly circles.

Amongst the Aikṣvākas of the time, the voluptuous Agni-varṇa (87) ;[5] fatally addicted to harem pleasures, and the weak prince Bṛhadvala (94), whose fall at the Bhārata battle was bewailed by his large number of wives,[6] are typical of the decline of Kośala. Amongst the East Ānavas also, polygamy is now mentioned again: Vṛhanmanas[7] (86) having two queens, from whose sons were derived two branch dynasties, and Karṇa[8] (94) marrying several wives 'according to the custom of the family and the selections of his adoptive father Adhiratha.' Amongst the Pāñcālas (Pauravas), the Southern section (of the above-mentioned Nīpa's line) developed scandalous harems under priestly influence during Aṇuha and Brahmadatta (86—87),—as the Buddhist[9] as well as some epic[1] traditions show, in spite of some other epic glosses which connect these kings with the 'Yoga' cult.[2] In the Northern section, Drupada (93) followed up the polygamy of Somaka (probably to be placed at 90 within this period); one of his queens[3] (a sister-wife) is mentioned by name, but she was not the mother of Kṛṣṇā and Dhṛṣṭadyumna, who may have been born of an abducted and widowed Kośala queen whom Drupada (re)married[4]; Sikhaṇḍinī too, was born of (or adopted by) "the eldest queen" of Drupada;[5] and there were numerous other children by other wives, with whom Drupada was not satisfied;[6] he also gave away, along with Kṛṣṇā, numbers of slave-girls to his son-in-law;[7] and in connection with the sex-fraud of Śikhaṇḍinī, who was married to the Daśārṇa princess, a commission of courtesans from the Daśārṇa court was admitted into the Pāñcāla harem to find out and report on the truth.[8] In the Dvimīḍha section, Ugrāyudha's (90) demanding the transference of the widowed Paurava queen Satyavatī to himself,[9] plainly indicates that with his conquests and sudden rise to power, he was making additions to the 'punarbhū' section of his seraglio,[10] and was simply following up his inevitable appropriation of the North and South Pāñcāla harems.[11] Amongst the Kurus (Pauravas), the cases of Pratīpa (87, or 89?) and Śantanu (90) are negative and inferable: the former could be polygamous but 'restrained himself' (voluntarily or compulsorily),[12]—or his actual polygamy and transference of harem to his successor Śantanu may possibly have been amended in this way;[13] the latter had two wives, but not at the same time apparently[1]; yet his evident laxity[2] and the statement that his first wife had to employ all her arts of singing, dancing and coquetry to please him[3] are indications of his harem-life. Pratīpa's other descendant, however, the Vāhlīka (Paurava) prince Bhūriśravas, had a number of wives[4]; and in the next generation, Vicitravīrya (91)[5] is a polygamist of the Agnivarṇa type (87) : his three wives are well-known to tradition,[6] but obviously he had many more in his short span of life; and if Vidura's mother was really only an 'apsarôpamā dāsī'[7] and not a princess-wife of secondary rank, then it would indicate concubinage of slave-girls in his harem[8]; but princess or slave-girl, she was a lawful 'kṣetra' of the king,[9] and no doubt others like her were. Of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, only one wife and one concubine are named, Gāndhārī and a Vaiśyā[10] maid-in-waiting (taken into favour during the former's pregnancy),[11] but clearly he had many more to have 102 children; in fact the alleged circumstances[12] of the birth of Yuyutsu and the other sons, the consistence and frequency with which

---

[1] The working out of these parallels would lead to many interesting and suggestive results.

[2] Bṛhadd.: III, 141—50, etc.; with Ṛv. I, 126.

[3] For the considerations that might help in locating him, vide Pargiter, AIHT., p. 223; the 3rd alternative is suggested by the occurrence of Sunaya and Vītahavya as kings (90 and 91) in the Videha line, the mention of a Lomaśa ṛṣi in the same time in Mbh., and its mention of Caṇḍa-Kauśika of Girivraja of the same period as a son of Kākṣīvant.

[4] Balarāma and Revatī, and Droṇa and Kṛpī.

[5] Raghuvaṃśa: XIX, evidently based on common Purāṇic tradn. which it closely follows in many dynastic and personal details.

[6] Mbh. (Strī-vil.°): XI, 25, 715.

[7] Hariv. 31, 1705-6; Vāyu: 99, 110 ff.; Matsya: 48, 105-8; (these were 2 sisters, dtrs. of a Vainateya, Śaivya or Caidya king, prob. the last).

[8] Mbh. § 569 (Bhagavadyāna.°): V, 143; cf. 'wives of Karṇa who would become widows': Mbh. VIII, 87, (end). His son Vikarṇa also is stated to have had 100 sons: Hariv. 31, 1710.

Cf. the several 'harem'-scandals related of these courts in the Jātakas, where the 'Brahmadatta' is evidently the Purāṇic one, the chief figures in the stories being the ministers Kaṇḍarī and Pāñcāla-caṇḍa.

---

[1] Thus the epic statement that Brahmadatta's queen became a courtesan agrees fully with the Jātaka statements regarding the amours of his mother and wives.

[2] This does not mean anything; 'Yoga' cult was probably non-existent in 1100 B. C.; besides 'Yoga' is a cloak for many scandals; e.g. Karṇa was begotten by 'Yoga'; etc.; vide n. 1.

[3] Pṛṣatī; vide ante. She may have been the chief queen; but vide n. 15.

[4] As the Jātaka tradn. has it: cf. Jātakas (Cowell): V, 225, etc.

[5] Mbh. § 573 (Ambop.°): V, 188; her "co-wives," for fear of whom she concealed Śikhaṇḍinī's sex: ibid. 190-191.

[6] It is therefore that he wanted other offspring; and as a result of his sacrifices and prayers, Draupadī, Dhṛṣṭadyumna and Śikhaṇḍinī were 'born.'

[7] Vide n. 5. p. 214.

[8] Mbh. V, 192.

[9] Hariv. 20, 1085-1112.

[10] Vide notice of such a section in connection with 'widow-remarriage (cf. his ancestor Ajamīḍha's 'punarbhū' wife).

[11] Ugrāyudha completely conquered N. and S. Pāñcālas, expelling and exterminating the princes.

[12] Details in Mbh. § 162 (Sambhava.°): I, 97; compulsion is more probable, as his queen was a Śaivyā (cf. Jyāmagha's case).

[13] This would seem to be the real fact behind the story, sp. when compared with the Jyāmagha story, and taken with Satyavatī's proposal of transferring the wives of Vicitravīrya to his next successor,

---

[1] Bhīṣma's mother was, however living all along,—only she had left Śantanu (or was left by him); e.g. she educates Bhīṣma for several years; takes part in the Ambā episode, and is stated to have been living at the time of his death,—which is not very probable.

[2] As shown in his adventures in the course of hunting expeditions and his treatment of Bhīṣma

[3] Mbh. I, 98.

[4] Mbh. § 619 (Strī-vil.°) : X, 24 (i), 687; the chief wife seems to be mentioned in XV, 808. (Putradarś'.°).

[5] Mbb. I, 102; cf. Viṣ. IV, 20, 10.

[6] He may have had 4, if Ambā had agreed to marriage with him.

[7] Mbh. I, 106, 4297.

[8] Slave-concubinage was not unknown to Kuru court circles before this; Kavaṣa-Ailūṣa (74). chaplain to the Kurus, was born of such a slave-girl, which was a 'subject of much comment'; cf. the parallel case of Uddālaka son of the Pāñcāla chaplain and a slave-girl, soon after this period (96/97).

[9] Mbh. I, 1, 94; 63, 2441; 105, 4224; cf. Br. 13, 120-'1; Hariv. 32. 1825-'6; Vā. 99, 235-'42 Mat. 50, 47.

[10] The notice of Vaiśyā concubines in this and some other cases, prob. points to the existence of customs similar to those noted in Vāts. Kā. Sūt. for the post-Maurya period (*i.e.* presentation to the court of beautiful daughters and wives by the tenants).

[11] Mbh. I, 115.

[12] These are indicated in :—Mbh. § 180 (Sambhav.°) : I. 115 (within a month the 100 sons and 1 dtr. of Dhṛta.° were born; during Gāndh.°'s pregnancy Dhṛta.° begot the Karaṇa Yuyutsu on a Vaiśyā maid); cf. enumeration of Dhṛta.°'s sons in order of succession of birth (so that the mothers were separate) : Mbh. I, 117. It is to be noted that at first only 11 names of these sons are given (Mbh. I. 2446); then at the time of Drau.°'s svayaṃvara, 23 are named : (Mbh. I, 6984 ff.); so that these sons were evidently not born at the same time and were born of different mothers. Yuyutsu's mother was something more than a concubine, almost a legal wife, as he is regarded as the continuer of Dhṛta.'°s line and his 'piṇḍadātā' : Mbh. § 577 (Bhīṣma-vadha.°) : VI, 43, 1626; cf. other refs. to his birth from the Vaiśyā wife in :—Mbh. I, 63; II, 74, etc.

Duryodhana is called 'Gāndhāri' (or equivalents),[1] and Dhṛtarāṣṭra's statement that he was his son by his *eldest* queen, proves that there were other wedded wives and concubines too; Dhṛtarāṣṭra is always found attended by female slaves[2] who help him in his toilet and bath, and he consoles his son Duryodhana (envious of Pāṇḍava opulence) by pointing out what a choice lot of pleasure-girls and wives he has placed at his disposal.[3]

Dhṛtarāṣṭra's sons also were polygamous: besides the equipment already noted, Duryodhana had at least two wives, one distinguished as the mother of the heir-apparent Lakṣmaṇa,[4] the other the Kaliṅga princess abducted from her 'svayaṃvara'[5]; he had doubtless concubines amongst the female slaves of the palace, like his father, as is shown by his indecent attitude towards Draupadī in his 'sabhā,' whom he won into slavery and then invited to be his concubine[6]; several of Duryodhana's brothers had separate palaces and establishments[7] (appropriated subsequently by the 4 younger Pāṇḍavas), which implies similar polygamy: thus, in the epic, Vidura is ascribed such a separate establishment and one wife (a Vṛṣṇi-Yādava princess),[8] without any particulars, —but the Jātaka traditions suppliments it by ascribing to him 9 palaces and numerous women,—the full polygamous and luxurious royal style, equally with the reigning Pāṇḍava sovereign.[9] Even Dhṛtarāṣṭra's relatives by marriage, Subala of Gāndhāra (Druhyu or Aikṣvāka?) and Jayadratha of Sindhu (Druhyu or W. Ānava?), whose obscure families seem to have had no tradition of polygamy behind them, are found to be equally polygamous: thus Subala had a son who is distinguished from Śakuni, etc., by an added metronymic[10]; and Jayadratha, early in the life-time of Duḥśalā, apparently contracted another marriage with a Śālva princess, for he was marching in wedding procession to her country, when he met Draupadī[11] (a sister-in-law), and tried to abduct her to make her his wife;[1] his dead body is surrounded by his foreign slave-women,[2] who no doubt also kept him company in his life-time.

---

[1] Called 'Gāndhārī' 31 times in Mbh.; cf. Sörensen: Index, p. 279.

[2] E.g. Mbh. XI, 12—13; cf. sons of Śūdrā concubines compared with those of princesses like Gāndhārī: XI, 26 (beg).

[3] Mbh. II, 49; cf. young women of Dhṛta.°'s palace at the disposals of the Pāṇḍavas (guests): II, 58; cf. also III, 239 ff.

[4] Mbh. XI: 17B, 511.

[5] Mbh. XII, 4.

[6] Mbh. II, 71.

[7] Mbh. XII, 44, 1517 ff.

[8] Mbh. I, 114, 4481—2; II, 78, 2568; 79; cf. I, 129. It is quite possible that Kuntī lived with him as a wife, after her return from Śataśṛṅga and during Pāṇḍava exile.

[9] Cowell: Jātakas, VI, 126 ff.; 1,000 wives and 700 courtesans and slave-girls in his palaces (p. 145).

[10] Mbh. VII, 49, 1933.

[11] Mbh. III, 264, 15576.

Pāṇḍu also, like his brothers, was polygamous. The similarity with Vicitravīrya's case makes it probable that he had more than two wives (Kuntī and Mādrī); the deer-story is clearly an invention to explain away the fact that Pāṇḍu was another victim to the prevalent debauchery of the courts of this period; Pāṇḍu's own comparison of himself with Vicitravīrya, and Kuntī's comparison with Vyuṣitāśva,[3] both childless, voluptuous and stricken with consumption in early youth, were thus quite appropriate.

In spite of the polyandry, the Pāṇḍavas were as good polygamists, each one of them having other 'individual' wives besides the common wife, who was the 'mahiṣī.' Thus[4] Yudhiṣṭhira married a Śaivyā princess, Bhīma the Kāśi princess Balandharā (and the 'Rākṣasa' princess Hiḍimbā, in his early youth),—Arjuna the Kauravya-Nāga princess Ulūpī, the Maṇipūra (Kaliṅga?) princess Citrāṅgadā, his cousin the Vṛṣṇi princess Subhadrā (while he received offers of concubinage from one 'Urvaśī,' and of marriage with Uttarā-Vairāṭī),—Nakula the Cedi princess Kareṇumatī, and Sahadeva the Madra princess Vijayā, the 3rd daughter of Jarāsandha of Magadha, and the Yādava princess Bhānumatī. Apart from these royal wives, the Pāṇḍavas also appear to have had as 'full' harems as their predecessors and cousins at Hāstinapura. They obtained slave-girls[5] from Drupada along with their common wife; at Indraprastha their palace was filled with large numbers of female slaves and attendants of all ranks and descriptions,—amongst whom were bejewelled court dancing-girls and 'artistes,' over whom Draupudī kept a vigilant eye, and every one of whom she knew by face and features,[6]—but with whom nevertheless, Draupadī and Subhadrā, together with the princes, indulged in drunken, voluptuous merriment, in the royal summer resorts on the Yamunā.[7] Eunuchs also formed part of the harem establishment (as they did at the Matsya court),[1] for Draupadī herself had a favourite eunuch for her personal attendant[2] (which seems to be the original of the Jātaka statements about her corruption with a deformed slave).[3] The ranks of slave concubines must have considerably swelled with the lavish nuptial presents from Subhadrā's kinsmen, the Vṛṣṇis, of youthful South-Western slave beauties[4] (very probably imported in regular traffic by sea),[5]—and with similar presents of Kairātikī (Tibeto-Burman?) and Māgadhī (Dravido-Kolārian?) slave-girls from subordinated or friendly chieftains.[6] Thus it was that the Pāṇḍavas could, it is said, provide 30 slave-girls for each of the 88,000 'snātaka' brāhmaṇs resident in their capital,[7] and at the Rājasūya could give away as many to each of the assembled priests (with suitable temporary quarters, in the sacrificial area, for their new acquisitions),—thus earning brāhmaṇical gratitude and laudation.[8] This large and choice collection Yudhiṣṭhira lost to the Dhārtarāṣṭras by gambling.[9] But even in the interval of exile, the Pāṇḍavas continued to be attended by the slave-girls obtained along with Draupadī, with whose restoration they too would be legally returned to them; and they were recovered after their great victory, augmented with the only temporarily sent to the Pāñcāla court for convenience.[10] What the Pāṇḍavas lost to the Dhārtarāṣṭras they must have appropriation of the several establishments of the defeated and killed princes;[11] and no doubt Bhīma was then able to fulfil his promise on the battle-field to his charioteer Viśoka of providing him with a hundred choice slave-wives and suitable establishment.[12]

---

[1] Mbh. II, 267—268.

[2] Mbh. XI, 22, 627; cf. the Sauvira prince Sañjaya urged by his mother Vidulā to enjoy sovereignty along with his Sauvīra damsels and avoid the fate of being ruled by the Sindhu King and his Saindhava damsels: V, 134.

[3] Mbh. I, 120—121; cf. Viṣ. IV, 20, 10.

[4] Mbh. I, 95; 154—155; 214; 215; 219—221; III, 22, 898; 45—46; IV, 70 ff.; IV, 90, 3977-'83; XV, 1, 24; 25, 668; etc, etc.; also, Hariv. 149, 8547; 32: Br. 13; Vā. 240-'43; Mat. 50, 51-'7; Viṣ. IV, 20, 11—12; etc.

[5] Mbh. I, 198; cf. 196 (slave-girls at Pāñcāla court); vide n. 9 and 10, p. 215.

[6] Mbh. III, 233—235.

[7] Mbh. I, 224.

---

[1] Mbh. IV, 11.
[2] Mbh. LV, 1.
[3] Cowell : Jāt. V. 225 ff.
[4] Mbh. I, 223; Pāṇḍavas received slave girls from Yādavas on the occasion of Uttarā's marriage, also : IV, 72.
[5] Thus the island possessions of the Yādavas in the Arabian Sea (Ratna-dvīpa) were noted for their trade in gems and women : Hv. 95, 5233 ff.
[6] Mbh. II, 52, 1867; cf. XLV, 85; also VIII, 38, 1770.
[7] The figures are of course exaggerations; but that does not affect the point here. Mbh. IL, 49; vide n. 5, p. 214.
[8] Mbh. II, 33; the brāhmaṇs who had come into close contact with the Paurava courts immediately before this, were also inclined towards polygamy or laxity amounting to it; thus the Vāśiṣṭhas Parāśara (Sagara) and Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana (90 and 92) had offspring by more than one woman, some of them being Paurava princesses. (It is to be noted that the brāhmaṇs connected with the Kuru, Pāṇḍava and Pāñcāla courts in this period are mainly Vāśiṣṭhas and Kāśyapas, and partly Āṅgirasas, all of the inner Mānva group by origin).
[9] Mbh. LI, 60—61.
[10] Mbh. III, 23 (beg.).
[11] Mbh. XII, 44, 1517 ff.
[12] Mbh. VIII, 76.

Amongst the families closely related to the Pāṇḍavas, polygamy is found with the Vasu-ite Pauravas, of Cedi, Magadha and Matsya, besides the Yādavas, who form a great polygamic group by themselves. The Caidya Śiśupāla (half-Yādava, half-Paurava), in addition to his unspecified wife or wives, had relations with Bhadrā-Vaiśālī[1] and Babhru-Yādava's wife[1], and was betrothed to Rukmiṇī whom he would have been glad to obtain even later on[1]; his polygamy is thus inferable. The Māgadha-Paurava cases of Vasu and Vṛhadratha have already been noted as probably assignable to this period; no details are given about Jarāsandha's own wife or wives, but two of his daughters were married to Kaṃsa-Yādava[2]; and "māgadhi" slave-girls having been at this time presented to the Pāṇḍava court,[3] they must also have been part of the equipment of the Magadhan court. About the Kāśis of this time (intermarried with Kurus, Pāṇḍavas and Pāñcālas) no polygamies are mentioned, unless the twin wives of Vṛhadratha and the cases of Ambikā and Ambālikā are taken as evidence for the Kāśi court itself; but apparently the Kāśi prince who was a contemporary of Dhṛṣṭadyumna in his youth, was polygamous.[4] Particulars about the Matsyas are much fuller: Virāṭa had at least two chief wives, Sudeṣṇā of Kekaya, and the sister of 'Kīcaka,'[5]—and he had obviously a big 'harem'; his young son Uttara is already a gay reveller in the company of numerous women.[6] The court of Virāṭa is of the same type as that of the Pāṇḍavas, whom indeed he tries to follow and emulate in many respects: there is the same fondness for gambling,[7] and employment of eunuchs in the personal service of the princesses,[8] the same normal concubinage of the female attendants of the palace,[9] and voluptuous harem-life of the princes amongst multitudes of women, with song, and dance, and wine[10];—all illustrated in the Indraprastha and Hāstinapura courts; in one respect apparently the Matsya court made an improvement, in special arrangements[11] for dances as a court pastime; but probably this was

---

[1] Mbh. II, 45; Hv. 117.

[2] Mbh. II, 14, 594; Hariv. 91, 4955-'61.

[3] Mbh. II, Rājasū.° & Dyūta.°

[4] Mbh. VII, 10, 364.

[5] Mbh. IV, 249. 432. 562. etc.; 18, 529 (Kīcaka a śyāla; hence, Virāta had another queen, a Kicakī, for Sudeṣṇā was a Kaikeyī).

[6] Mbh. IV, 35 ff.

[7] Of Virāṭa, who was glad to employ the supposed expert games-master of Yudhiṣṭhira.

[8] Of Vṛhannalā-Arjuna as dancing-master and personal companion of Uttarā, who almost fell in love with him.

[9] Cf. the cool presumption of the king's brother-in-law, as well as of the queen, with regard to Draupadī the Sairandhrī.

[10] E.g. the life led by the effeminate Uttara even in times of great danger, and by the martial Kicaka addicted to wine and women.

[11] Thus there was a special dancing-hall, apart from the usual 'sabhā', where court ladies had free access.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

in imitation of the adjacent Yādava courts of the South-West, where, from much earlier ages, whole royal families trained themselves[1] as expert singers and dancers, with occasional resultant scandals.

Amongst the Yādavas of the same period, full-fledged polygamy is almost the general rule with the confederate clans of Dvārāvatī (at first of Mathurā) headed by the Vṛṣṇis,— and they were the representative Yādavas of this age, just as the Caitrarathas and Haihayas were of an earlier one; instances of polygamy sometimes occur also amongst other contemporary branches of the Yādavas.

Taking the Vṛṣṇis, amongst whom Kṛṣṇa was born, we find instances of polygamy in all its four main branches. The group indeed began with the polygamy of 'Vṛṣṇi,' who, as already noted, may be placed within this period as well (at 88/89). In the first branch, Satrājit (92/93) married 10 sisters,[2] and of his daughters three were given in marriage to their cousin Kṛṣṇa.[3] In the second, Akrūra had at least three wives named in the lists,[4] besides others who took part in Raivataka and other festivities,[5] and who all retired to a Himālayan hermitage after his death.[6] In the fourth, no definite particulars are available, but both Śini and Sātyaki-Yuyudhāna were 'bride-abductors' of the Kṛṣṇa type,[7] and their polygamy is quite likely; the Vedic story about Asaṅga-Yādava,[8] which has a marked 'harem' character, might very well refer to Satrājit's son or grandson Asaṅga[9]; and another Asaṅga, a son or grandson of Sātyaki, was apparently settled by Arjuna on the Sarasvatī, with a part of the remnant of the Yādava harems.[10] For the third branch more details are forthcoming, being Kṛṣṇa's own family. Devamīḍhūṣa

---

[1] E.g. in the families of Durjaya, Tittiri, Revata, and amongst the Vṛṣṇis of Kṛṣṇa's time. Uttarā's training in dancing was not exceptional amongst the Pauravas; Śāntanu's first queen was an expert dancer and singer; and the eunuch whom Arjuna personated, must have done similar service to Draupadī.

[2] Vā. 96, 53; Br. 16, 45; Hv. 39, 2076; cf. Mat. 45, 1—19.

[3] Br. 16, 47—8; Hv. 39, 2078—9; gr. dtrs. : Mat. 45, 19—21 : cf. Vā. Br. 16, 55; 14, 8; 11; Bd. III, 71, 113; Hv.

[4] Sutanu Augrasenī : 35, 1919; 39, 2086; Ratnā Śaibyā : Mat. 45, 27—32; Aśvinī : ibid.

[5] Mbh. I, 219, and Pur.° acc. of Raivataka and Prabhāsa festivities; cf. land and sea sports at Dvārakā where Bhānumati is abducted. Hv. 147—149.

[6] Mbh. XVI, 6, 157; 7, 248.

[7] Śini : Mbh. VII, 144, 6032—43; Sātyaki : VII, 10, 338; for abductions by Kṛṣṇa, cf. Mbh. II, 45, 1574—7; III, 12, 575; V, 130; 158, 535 ff.; 5364; 48, 1881 ff; VII, 11, 391 ff.; etc.

[8] Rv. VIII, 1; cf. Mait. Saṃ. III, 1, 9; Bṛhadd. II, 8, 3; VI, 41; etc.

[9] Padma. V, 13, 94—6; cf. Mat. 45, 19—21.

[10] Mbh. XVI, 7, 245 ff.

(89/90) probably had two wives, one an Aśmakī,[1] and the other a daughter of Āryaka the Nāga chieftain (on the Upper Ganges)[2]; his son Śūra (91/92) also, is ascribed two queens.[3] In the next generation, Vasudeva (92/93) is a prolific polygamist: amongst his 20 wives who bore him children, were his 7 cousins, daughters of Devaka, 7 Nāga princesses, and 2 maids-in-waiting, besides Rohiṇī-Pauravī (sister of Vāhlīka), Bhadrā-Vaiśālī, and Madirā (which three, with Devakī of the first group, ascended his funeral pyre).[4] His eldest son Rāma is ascribed only one wife, Revatī,[5] but his monogamy was apparently not puritanic, as he took a prominent part in the Yādava drunken orgies,[5] and is said to have indulged in wine and women along with Kṛṣṇa while on a military expedition to the Gomanta hills and Karavīrapura (in lower Deccān).[5] But Kṛṣṇa followed his father and went far beyond him,— being in fact the greatest polygamist of his age. Much detail is available[6] about the wives of Kṛṣṇa, even a summary of which would be lengthy; but they may be classified as—(i) cousins or near relatives given in marriage: e.g., Satyā-Sātrājitī and her sisters, Akrūra's sister, etc., (ii) external princesses (some of whom were related),

---

[1] Hariv. 35, 1922 ff.; Bḍ. III, 71, 145—6.

[2] Mbh. I, 128, 5026; cf. V. 103, 3635; etc.

[3] Vā. 96, 143—44 (prob. 3 wives); etc.; cf. Hv. 95, 5251—52, where Vasudeva's f. is called Vasu (for Śūra) and is ascribed 3 wives.

[4] Vā. 96, 129—31; 149—166; Bḍ. III, 71, 145—163; Mat, 44, 72—3; 46, 11—21; etc.; cf. Mbh. II, 1570; VII, 144, 6032 ff.; XVI, 7, 224—253.

[5] (*a*) Vā. 86, 26—29; 88, 1—4; Bd. III, 61, 19—24; 63, 1—3; Br. 7, 30—41; Hv. 10, 644—11, 657; Viṣ. IV, 1, 20—37; 2, 1—2; cf. Mbh. I, 219, 7912.
(*b*) e.g., in the Raivataka and Prabhāsa festivities.
(*c*) Hv. 98, 5405-'39.

[6] Jāmbavatī, Satyabhāmā & Akrūra's sister: Vā. 96, 20—98, Br. 16. 12—45; 17, 1—40. Rukmiṇī: Hariv. 161, 9134—6; 117—118. Gāndhārī: Hv. 161, 9147—8; 174, 9797. Kālindī-Mitravindā Satyā-Nāgnajitī, Rohiṇī-Jāmbavatī, Suśīlā-Mādrī, Satyā-Sātrājitī, Lakṣmiṇa-Jālahāsinī, Tanvī-Śaibyā: Hv. 118, 6700—6706. 15 wives detailed: Mat. 47, 13—23. Satrājit's 3 dtrs., Satyā, Vratinī, Tapasvinī (or var. lec.): Br. 16, 47—8; Hv. 39, 2078—9; Mat. 45, 19—21; Bḍ. III, 71, 242—264. For Mbh. refs. to brides abducted by Kṛṣṇa, vide n. 7, p. 217. 16,000 wives *and* principal wives (widows, self-immolating, retiring or captured): Mbh. XVI, 6; 7; for 16,000 (captured from Naraka), cf. Mbh. I, 2789; V, 130; 153, 5353 ff.; XIII, 15 (end); 160, 7422 f.; XVIII, 5, 171—3; cf. Hv. 122—124. For Mbh. refs. *re* Satyabhāmā, vide III, 183, 12567; 233—235; IV, 9, 262; *re* Rukmiṇī: II, 2; XIII, 617; 621 ff.; 139 (beg); 149 (beg.); 160, 7416 ff.; cf. Hv. 14406 ff.; *re* Jāmbavatī: III, 670; 10271; XIII, 14—15. Mbh. XVI supplies Haimavatī as the name of another chief wife. Cf. generally, Br. 199, 201, 202, 205, 212; Hv. 37 1947—68; 124, 6962—6999; 162; Padma. V, 123; 170. For shepherdesses as wives or concubines, cf. Br. 184; 189; 193; Hv. 78—79; cf. Mbh. II, 2291.

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

either ordinarily married, or abducted by force (in 'svayaṃvaras' or other circumstances involving fighting): e.g., (a) Suśīlā-Mādrī, etc., (b) Rukmiṇī-Vaidarbhī, Satyā-Nāgnajitī, Jāmbavatī, etc.,—the first three being related, (iii) sundry others, numbering altogether several thousands, 'married' or in concubinage,—consisting of other harems transferred by conquest, of 'artistes,' slaves, and probably even shepherdesses in state employ.

Thus the entire harem of Naraka of Prāgjyotiṣa was transferred to Dvārāvatī;[1] its numerical strength is usually put at 16,000 and only once at 1,000.[2] Elsewhere the grand total of Kṛṣṇa's 'wives' is put at 60,000;[3] probably this is intended to include the above 16,000, as well as the 16,000 shepherdesses he dallied with,[4] the remaining number being slaves; but possibly this detail of 16,000 'gopinīs' may have arisen out of the more authentic one about Naraka's transferred harem. Or this also may have been true: for one thing, the theory that Kṛṣṇa's 'gopa-līlā' is an Ābhīra accretion of later times, is untenable, as the Ābhīras are traditionally connected with the Yādavas and the whole of the South-West of India, from the time of Haryaśva and Madhu (*i.e.*, bet. 27 and 63), and formed the subject population under the Yādavas;[5] other Ābhīras again are mentioned as attacking the fallen Yādavas;[6] they may have been rebel tribesmen having their day after all the injury they had suffered from Kṛṣṇa, probably even, thus reclaiming their women, abducted by the rulers from time to time;—for another, concubines of the Vaiśya class were customarily taken into the Paurava and Yādava harems of this time (e.g., with Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Vasudeva),[7] as also much eariler, in Aikṣvāka and Vaiśāleya ones probably (e.g., Daśaratha's queen Sumitrā was a daughter of such a Vaiśyā, and Nābhāga abducted a Vaiśya tenant's daughter)[1]; the traditional license of princes and high officials with regard to state-shepherdesses and other work-women is noted by Vātsyāyana[2]; and in Kṛṣṇa's time the Yādava clans rose to opulence largely by such state-pastures (cf. the 'vraja' settlement under Nanda, and the details of Kālayavana's birth,—both showing connection of princes with the 'gopinīs').[3] A 'thousand' of Naraka's women are stated to have been "married" to Kṛṣṇa[4]; thus the major portion of that lot of 16,000 remained only concubines; to one of these sections, probably to the former and more favoured one, must have belonged those select 'gandharva' maidens (i.e., dancers and singers) whom Naraka had collected in his specially built hill-station of Maṇiparvata.[5] Kṛṣṇa's harem evidently included slave-beauties also,[6] numbers of whom he sent to the Pāṇḍava court, and assigned to the ṛṣi Durvāsas[7] when he lived in his palace as a guest. It is noteworthy in this connection, that a kindred Yādava clan (under Hārīta) is stated to have colonized some generations back, an island Ratna-dvīpa in the South-Western Sea, which was specially noted for its pearls and beautiful women, and peopled by 'niṣāda' sea-faring merchants and 'madgura' pearl fishers[8]; the reference is obviously to the pearl and slave trade of the Arabian Sea, a very ancient one indeed, going back to the second millenium B.C. and the pre-Āryan civilizations of South-Western India. It is rather striking that the number 16,000 is attributed to the harems of other princes of the Epic age also, by the Jātaka tradition[9]; and ancient Persian harems were equally large;[1] after all it may not have been altogether an exaggeration, and is intelligible when some of the astounding traditional royal customs and privileges noticed by Vātsyāyana[2] for a subsequent period are taken into consideration.

---

[1] Vide ante, sec. *re* widow-remarriage; Hv. 123, 6934-'61; Br. 202; etc.; cf. n. 2 below.

[2] 16000: Mbh. V, 158, 5353 ff.; 1000: Mbh. V, 130.

[3] Mbh. XLII, 160 (end). Here again all the figures are obvious exaggerations standing for 'a large number.'

[4] Vide n. 6, p. 218, *re* gopinīs.

[5] E.g., the Ābhīra settlements ('vraja') at Gokula, Vṛndāvana, etc., under pastoral chiefs like Nanda, and owing allegiance to Yādava princes; vide n. 6, p. 218, *re* gopinīs. Ābhīras under Haryaśva and Madhu: Hv. 5142—5167. Vide Sör. Index, s. v.; bands of Ābhīras of the S. W. were also subj. to the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas.

[6] Mbh. XVI, 7; Br. 210—212; Viṣ. V, 37—38; Pad. VI, 279, 56 f.; Ag. 15; etc.

[7] Dhṛta.°: Mbh. I, 63; 115, 4522, etc.; II, 74; etc. Vasudeva: Mat. 46, 11—21; cf. Bḍ. III, 71, 163. With Vaiśyā concubines may be compared Śūdrā concubines at the same two courts, e.g., with Devaka & Vicitravīrya: Mbh. I, 114, 4480; 109, 4361; etc.

---

[1] Daś.°: 'Sumitrā Vāmadevasya Vabhūva Karaṇī-Sutā'; Nābh.°: Mārk. 113 ff. (where the rule is mentioned that the 1st wife of a prince must be Kṣatriyan, and other wives may belong to other castes).

[2] Vāt. Kā Sūt. V, 5. So the number 16000 is not very much of an exaggeration; it would simply mean that all such women were exposed to the license of the Yādava rulers.

[3] Vide n. 6 (end), p. 218; *re* Kāla.°: Br. 196; 14, 48—56; Hariv. 115, 6428-'37; cf. Mbh. XII, 12959.

[4] Mbh. V, 130. But (perhaps in a general way) 16,000 'widows' are spoken of in Mbh. XVI, 5, 144, and 16,000 "parigrahāḥ" in I, 2789; XVI, 138; XVIII, 171—73; cf. XIII, 160, 7422 ff.

[5] Hv. 121; etc.; vide n. 1, p. 219.

[6] Vasudeva had at least 2 such 'wives' (vide ante); cf. Mbh. IV, 72.

[7] Not to be confused with the earlier Durvāsas; Mbh. XIII, 160,

[8] 7416 ff. This is practically the only instance of brāhmaṇical connection with Yādava polygamy,—which for this period, seems to have been rather a result of military power and opulence by trade, etc., as also with the Haihayas mainly. The Yādavas of this age are in fact the least brāhmaṇical of the ruling families.

[9] Hv. 95, 5233 ff. [The recent Punjab and Sindh excavations prove that the Arabian Sea trade was flourishing in S. W. Indian ports in the 3rd millenium B. C., and was pre-Āryan.]

[10] Cowell: Jāt. I, 231 (84,000 w., of Sudarśana of Kuśāvatī or Kuśīnagara); 264 (16,000 w., of Brahmadatta of Vārāṇasī); 289 (of Br.° of Vār.°'s youngest of 100 sons, chosen King of Gāndhāra). III, 222 (of a Videha King); 246 (of Br.° of Vār.°). IV, 78

Of Kṛṣṇā's descendants, his sons Pradyumna and Sāmba had several wives; those of the former were[3]: Śubhāṅgī Vaidarbhī, his maternal uncle's daughter,—Prabhāvatī daughter of Vajranābha,—and Mayavatī, widow of Sambara (the last two being obtained by romantic adventures and force); those of the latter[4] were: Candrāvatī, niece of the same Vajranābha, and Duryodhana's daughter (both obtained by adventure and fighting); besides he had intrigues in his father's unwieldy harem[5] (for which he was cursed along with the guilty wives); and Pradyumna also must have had a richer harem-life than that indicated by his 3 wives, to earn his later estimation as an incarnation of Kāma.[6] Kṛṣṇa's grandson Aniruddha[7] also had two wives,—Rukmavatī of Vidarbha, also his maternal uncle's daughter,—and Ūṣā, daughter of Bāṇa of Soṇitapura (the latter obtained by adventure and fighting, as in the cases of Pradyumna and Sāmba); and Aniruddha's son Vajra inherited a considerable harem from his

---

(of Daśaratha of Kośala); 200 (of Suruci or Ruci of Mithilā;
acc. to custom of having 4,000 w. from 4 diff. sections of sub-
jects); 285, 288 (of Nāga King Campeya of Campā). V, 2 (of a
chaplain of the Vār.° King); 97-'8 (of Sūtasoma of Vār.°; 16,000
+700 principal wives: cf. VI, 30-31, of Mahā-Janaka,—VI, 75,
of Caṇḍa of Vār.°,—of Vidura of Indraprastha, etc.); 133 (16,000
w. passed, each one as wife, from the father Arindama of Magadha
to his son and succ. Dīrghavāhu); 141 (of Okkāka *i.e.* 'Aikṣvāka'
of Kuśāvatī or Kuśīnagara in Malla Kingdom;—sent out in
batches for open license in the streets, along with the chief queen,
so that some one of them might conceive and bring an heir to
the king who looks on). VI, 1 (of a Kāśirāja, the chief queen
being a Mādrī, Candā); 115 (of Aṅgati of Mithilā); 128 (cf
Dhanañjaya Kauravya of Indraprastha); 249 (of Sañjaya of Śīvi,
Mādrī Phusatī being chief queen); 252 (of his son Vessantara,
obtained along with his chief queen, another Mādrī).

[1] Sykes: Hist. Pers. I, 507 (12.000 w. of Khusru Parviz, Shirin being
chief queen). Cf. hundreds of wives of Achamenian Kings, e.g.
Artaxerxes Mnemon,—Sykes: Hist. Pers. I, 186-'7; 247; cf. also
3,000 desc. of Fath Ali Shah at his d.: I, 183.

[2] Vāts. Kā. Sūt. V, 5.

[3] Śubhāṅgī Vaidarbhī: Hv. 119, 6707-'26; Prabhāvatī, dtr. of Vajra-
nābha: Hv. 149, 8474; 150-156; Mayavatī, w. of Sambara: Hv.
163-167; Br. 200-201.

[4] Duryo.°'s dtr.: Hv. 120, 6765-86; Br. 208. Candrāvatī, niece of
Vajranābha: Hv. 150-156.

[5] Varāha. 177; etc.

[6] Mat. 4, 1-21; cf. Pradyumna and the dtrs. of Brahmadatta a Yādava
priest: Hv. 142, 7993-8053.

[7] Rukmavatī: Hv. 119, 6707-'26; Br. 201; Ūṣā, dtr. of Bāṇa: Hv
175-190; Br. 205-207.

predecessors, with which he was removed to Indraprastha[1] (with its Pāṇḍava harem traditions).

For the other groups of the confederacy, the details are much fewer; but the polygamy of their chief members is often alluded to in general terms; thus the 'Andhaka Mahābhoja,' Ugrasena and Āhuka(the Kukura leaders), had all their hundreds of wives, accompanying them in the Raivataka and Prabhāsa revelries.[2] Ugrasena's Vaidarbhī wife Padmāvatī's[3] illegitimate son Kaṃsa had two wives (daughters of Jarāsandha), as already noted. Devaka had, besides his chief wife or wives, at least one Vaiśyā or Śūdrā concubine,[4] whose daughter was married to Vidura-Kaurava. Kṛtavarman's section was also apparently polygamous, for his descendant and heir inherited a harem with which he was settled at Mārttikāvata.[5]

Amongst the other Yādava branches, no polygamies are ascribed to the Vidarbhas, consistently with the Vidarbhan tendency towards monogamy. But the Śālva (Mārttikāvata-Bhoja) prince, Mitrasaha, a contemporary of Vasudeva (92/93), had two wives (whose sons were the famous Haṃsa and Diṃbhaka or Nimi);[6] and probably the Kuntis were polygamous,—if the 'Urvaśī' episode of epic tradition may be referred to the court of Purujit-Kuntibhoja.[7]

After the polygamies of the century and a quarter described above, there was apparently a natural temporary reaction in the Paurava court,[8] no doubt aided by times of great stress and reverses,[9] clearly indicated even in the meagre tradition of the period. Thus only one wife (the princess of Madra)[10] is ascribed to Parikṣit II (96),[11]—though he may have inherited the Pāṇḍava harem in the same way as his contemporary and related Yādava princes.[12] His son Janamejaya III and his wife Vapuṣṭamā, the Kāśi princess, are stated to have been particularly devoted to each other and to have led a monogamistic life:[1] this agrees with what is said about Janamejaya's indignation at his queen's defilement through Yajurvedic ritual, and his reacceptance of her;[2] it is probable that Janamejaya led a reaction against the prevalent corrupt practices of the priesthood[3] and the court, with some amount of success,—which however was short-lived owing to brāhmaṇ hostility.[4] His son Śatānīka (98) also is ascribed one wife, a Vaidehī;[5] but Śvetakarṇa[6] (100 ?) probably had an usual harem, as he is said to have left for the woods owing to childlessness, before he met *en route*[7] the Yādava princess Mālinī (of Kṛtavarman's family) who bore him a son.[8]

---

[1] Mbh. XVI, 7; vide n. 6, p. 219.

[2] In all epic and Pur.° accounts of Raivataka and Prabhāsa or Dvārakā sports.

[3] Padma. II, 48-51. The statement that she mistook another person Gobhila for her husband Ugrasena, shows that she was only one of a large group of wives; cf. the case of Bhadrā-Vaiśālī, who being one of many wives could be similarly beguiled (by Śiśupāla).

[4] Vide n. 7, p. 219.

[5] Mbh. XVI, 7, 245.

[6] Hv. 295, 15387-'405.

[7] Vide *ante*, pp. 139—141.

[8] The Yādava (Indraprastha) and Pāñcāla courts very soon disappeared; and no personal details are available for Kāśi, Kośala, etc., for this period. Vide Pargiter AIHT. pp. 284-'5.

[9] Involving the retreat and amalgamation of the Kuru-Pāñcālas, disappearance of Yādava and W. Ānava kingdoms, and considerable contraction of the Epic horizon. Vide Pargiter AIHT. pp. 284-'5.

[10] Mādravatī: in all dynastic accounts.

[11] Abhimanyu had also only one wife, but he was killed at 16.

[12] Now on his Western frontier.

The Videha dynasty, remarkably free from indications of corruptions, shows the first clear instance of it in the time of Janaka-Ugrasena-Puṣkaramālin (98) or his successor, at whose court Aṣṭāvakra was entertained and tempted by courtesans or slave-girls.[9] But the notices of the subsequent Janakas like Dharmadhvaja (with his spiritual consort Sulabhā,[10] the 'bhikṣuṇī' daughter of a 'rājarṣi') or Janadeva (connected with Pañcaśikha),[10] show that this fall in moral standard was temporary or intermittent.

Apart from the already noted harem-inheritance of the three surviving Yādava princes, the only other pertinent

---

[1] In all dynastic accounts.

[2] Hv. 195, 11232-11278; cf. J.°'s discussion with Vyāsa *re* evils of
horse-sacrifice : Hv. 192, 11092. ff.; cf. also Mat. 50, 57-65 and Vā.
99, 250-6.

[3] For which cf. also the traditions connecting them with laxity and
prostitution; vide infra.; cf. also laxity of Ruci, w. of Deva-
śarman, a contemp. of Janamejaya : Mbh. XIII, 40 ff.

[4] The general tendency of the priesthood and the Courts to laxity and
polygamy showed no signs of abating in this post-Bhārata period,
and the two groups went on corrupting one another till the rise
of Buddhism, which for some time kept these in check.

[5] E.g. Mbh. I, 95, 3838. But another son Candrāpīḍa (unless he is
the same as Śatānīka) had '100 sons' (called Jāṇamejaya Kṣātras) :
Hv. 191, 11065-'7.

[6] Hv. 191, 11068-11072; Br. 13, 124-132.

[7] This probably shows abandonment of Mārttikāvata also (like Indra-
prastha and Hāstinapura) and pushing back of the Bhojas on the
Kauśāmbī side.

[8] About 3 centuries later the famous Udayana of this line had a full-
fledged harem.

[9] Mbh. III, 132, 10599-134, 10690; XIII, 19, 1390 f.; cf. Rām. VI,
121, 16; Br. 212, 72 f.; Śuka, son of Vyāsa, was similarly tempted
either at this or at another somewhat earlier Janaka's court :
Mbh. XII, 326; cf. another earlier Janaka, temp. Pratardana,
cheering his troops with prospect of numerous Gandharva girls
in heaven : Mbh. XII, 99.

[10] Dharmadvaja and Sulabhā : Mbh. XII, 321, 11854 ff.; cf. Janaka and
Kauśalyā : XII, 18, 538-'71; Janadeva : XII, 218-219. Q.—Is
this Sulabhā the same as the Sulabhā Maitreyī of the Sūtras who
was honoured as a ṛṣi? Vide n. 9, p. 34.

Yādava detail for this period, is the fate of Kṛṣṇa's harem: Some of his chief wives resorted to 'sahamaraṇa,' and some others retired into forest life; but the great bulk of his famous '16,000' were carried off by the Ābhīras,[1] and are stated[2] to have been subsequently reduced to prostitution, in which profession they were confirmed and instructed by Dālbhya-Caikitāneya,—in the same manner, it is said, as the 'Dānava' women of yore were reduced to and instructed in that profession by 'Indra' after the 'Dānava' defeats; and several Purāṇas profess to give the substance of that instruction[3]; they give two explanations of this fall,—Kṛṣṇa's curse on his wives for their infidelity, and resultant ravishment by the Ābhīras,—and Aṣṭāvakra's cursing[4] a host of 'apsarases' (=Kṛṣṇa's wives) to become courtesans. Several important probabilities are suggested by these statements: firstly, that 'organized' prostitution (under royal patronage) may have arisen as early as the time of the first Aila kings,[5] under conditions associated with conquests and subjection; secondly, that the destructive Yādava wars[6] of the Epic Age produced repetition of similar conditions and results, on a large scale; thirdly, that between the harems of the time and courtesans the connection was very intimate, the former leading to the latter by degeneration, the latter to the former by sublimation,[7]—so that royal polygamy often implied patronage of prostitution;[1] fourthly, that the brāhmaṇs, were chiefly instrumental[2] in fostering and sanctioning the profession, as is shown by the prominent part played in these developments by Dālbhya-Caikitāneya and Aṣṭāvakra (nephew of the notorious Śvetaketu, connected with brāhmaṇical laxity, and a teacher of Erotics inclusive of Prostitution),—all of whom, remarkably enough, were Kuru-Pāñcāla brāhmaṇs, together with the two Pāñcala-Bābhravyas[3] similarly associated in tradition.

---

[1] Br. 212; cf. Mat. 70; Mbh. XVI, 5, 135. 144; 7, 223—270.

[2] Mat. 70; etc.

[3] Even the "courtesan's art" had its 'ṛṣi' and 'sūtrakāra' teachers: e.g. Śvetaketu, Pāñcāla-Bābhravya, Dattaka and Vātsyāyana; apparently Dālbhya was Śvetaketu's immediate predecessor in this respect (within 3 gens. of each other); some steps before him, another Pāñcāla-Bābhravya of Brahmadatta's court, has a similar reputation in tradition.

[4] An anachronism by three generations.

[5] Some of the early Aila kings were actually 'Indras,' acc. to tradition, and many others took part in the 'Devāsura' wars, as compared with only one early Mānva king, Kakutstha, who helped an 'Indra,' prob. his contemp. Aila, Nahuṣa, whose son married his daughter. Nahuṣa is stated to have taken a licentious turn after his victories, and Yayāti's unwieldy harem of Bhārgava-Dānava slave-girls, and his temptings by an 'Indra,' are well-known. The alleged development of prostitution by 'Indra's' victories may thus refer to this period, if there is *any* traditional basis for the statement; cf. wars temp. Raji and Yayāti: Mat. 24, 37 f.; 25, 8 f.; also 12 other wars: 47, 41-241.

[6] A comparative study of the whole body of Epic-Purāṇic tradition will give a clear impression that the 'Epic' age was a 'Yādava' age, and the Bhārata battle was only one incident in a series of destructive Yādava wars, singled out for epic treatment. The Purāṇas would seem to be quite right in their estimation of Kṛṣṇa as the central figure of the age; it is remarkable that one Pur.° refers to an earlier rather different acc. of Kṛṣṇa's exploits 'that reads like a śmaśāna': it explains the Purāṇic conception that he was 'born to lighten the burdens of the Earth.'

[7] These processes are illustrated in the courts of Brahmadatta of Pāñcāla (87) and his father (86), in Kṛṣṇa's harem (94), and in that of Arjuna's 'real' father (93) (whoever he may have been).

---

[1] Such patronage is indeed illustrated in very much earlier courts, as already noted,

[2] So also in earlier periods, the connection of Śukra-*Bhārgava* with Yayāti's slave-girls, of Datt-*Ātreya* with his host of pleasure girls (and with his contemporary *Kauśika's* addiction to courtesans), of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga-*Kāśyapa* with Aṅga courtesans, etc., are more than accidental; cf. Maitreya living with a courtesan at Vārānasī, temp. Vyāsa who stays with them as a gratified guest : Mbh. XII, 120-123; cf. also Nārada and the prostitute Pañcacūḍā (XIII, 38, 2203 ff.), or the ṛṣi Bodhya and Piṅgalā (XIII, 178; XII, 174).

[3] They are most probably not the same,

Bibliography

I. Brahmanical Works

Ṛgveda, Saṁhitā and Pad text with Sāyaṇa's commentary, Edited by F. Max Muller, Second Edition, 1890-1892.

Sāmaveda, Edited with translation by Th. Benfey, Leipzig, 1848; Edited by Satyavrat Samasrami, Calcutta, 1873.

Yajurveda, Edited by A. Weber, Berlin, 1871-1872; with the commentary by Mādhava, Calcutta, 1854-1899.

Atharvaveda, Edited by R. Roth and W.D. Whitney, Berlin, 1856; Edited with Sāyaṇa's Commentary by S.P. Pandit, Bombay, 1895-1898.

Aitareya Āraṇyaka, Edited by Th. Aufrecht. Bonn, 1879; Edited by K.S. Agashe, Poona, 1896.

Āpastambiya Dharmasūtra, Edited by G. Bühler, Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1892, 1894.

Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, Edited by R. Garbe, Calcutta, 1882-1902.

Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, Edited by A.G. Stenzler, Leipzig, 1864.

Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, Edited with translation by Bohtlingk, Leipzig, 1819.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad, Edited with translation by O. Bohtlingk, Leipzig, 1889.

Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra

Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, Edited by Rajendra Lal Mitra and Vidyabhushan, Calcutta, 1872.

Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa.

Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā, Edited by Von Schroeder, Leipzig, 1900-1911.

Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra.

Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, Edited by E.B. Cowell, Calcutta; Translated by A.B. Keith.

Lāṭāyana Śrauta Sūtra

Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā, Edited by A. Mahadeva Sastri and L. Śrīnivāsāchārya, Mysore, 1913.

Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad.

Nirukta, Edited with Durgāchārya's Commentary by V.K. Rajavade, Poona, 1921-1926; Edited and translated by Lakshman Swarup, 2 Vols., Lahore.

Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa, Edited by A. Vedantavagisa, Calcutta, 1869-1874.

Saṁhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, Edited by A.C. Burnell, Mangalore, 1877.

Śānkhāyana Āraṇyaka, Edited by Friedlander, Berlin, 1900 (I-II); E.B. Cowell, Calcutta (III-VI); A. B. Keith, Oxford, 1909 (VII-XV); Translated by A.B., Keith, London, 1908.

Śānkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, Edited with Commentary of Varadatta-Sūta Ānartiya and Govinda, by A. Hillebrandt, Hillebrandt, Calcutta-1886-1889.

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, Edited by A. Weber, London, 1885; Translated by J. Eggeling, S B E (Vols. 12, 26, 41, 43, 44), Oxford, 1882-1900.

Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad.

Taittirīya Āraṇyaka

Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, Edited by Rajendra Lal Mitra Calcutta, 1855-1870.

Taittirīya Saṁhitā, Edited by A. Weber, Berlin, 1871-1872; with a commentary of Mādhava, Calcutta-1854-1899. (Sāyaṇabhāṣya and Mahīdharabhāṣya).

Vajasneyi Saṁhitā, Edited with Mahīdhara's commentary by A. Weber, London, 1852.

Agni Purāṇa, Edited by Rajendra Lal Mitra, Bibliotheca Indica Series, Calcutta, 1873-1879; Edited under the Anandashrama Sanskrit Series, Poona, 1900; Translation by M.N. Dutt, Calcutta, 1901.

Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, Edited by R. Sharma Sastri, Mysore, 1909, 2nd ed. 1919, 3rd ed. 1924; Edited with comments by T. Ganapati Sastri 3 Vols., Trivandrum, 1924-1925.

Bhāgavat Purāṇa, Edited by V.L. Pansikar, Bombay, 1920; Translation by M.N. Dutt, Calcutta, 1895.

Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, Venkateswar Press, Bombay, 1913.

Garuḍa Purāṇa, Venkateswar Press, Bombay, 1913.

Harivaṁśa Purāṇa.

Mahābhārata.

Mārkaṇḍeya Puraṇa, Edited by K.M. Banerjea, Bibliotheca Series, Calcutta, 1862.

Matsya Purāṇa, Anandashrama Sanskrit Series, Poona, 1907; Translation by a Taluqdar of Oudh, Sacred Books of the Hindus, Allahabad, 1916-1917 (2vols.).

Padma Purāṇa, Edited by V.N. Mandlik, Anandashrama Sanskrit Series Poona, 1893-1894 (4 vols.).

Varāha Purāṇa, Edited by Hrishikesa Sastri, Bibliotheca Indica Series, Calcutta, 1893.

Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra.

Vāyu Purāṇa, Edited by Rajendra Lal Mitra, Bibliotheca

Indica Series, Calcutta, 1880-1888; Anandasharma Sanskrit Series, Poona, 1905.

Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Venkateswara Press, Bombay, 1889; Translation by H.H. Wilson, London, 1864-1870 (5 vols.).

II. Buddhist Works

Dīgha Nikāya, Edited by T.W. Rhys Davids and J.E. Carpenter, 3 vols, Pāli Text Society, London, 1890, 1903, 1911.

Jātakas, Edited by V. Fansboll, 7 vols. (Indexed by P. Anderson), London, 1877-1897; Translation under the Editorship of E.B. Cowell, 7 vols., Cambridge, 1895-1913.

III. Secondary Works

Baden Powell, B.H., *The Indian Village Community*, London, 1892.

———*The Land Systems of the British India*, 3 vols., London, 1892.

Bloomfield, M., *Hymns From the Atharvaveda*.

———*The Religion of the Veda*, New York, 1908.

Bühler, G., "Erklarung der Aśoka-Inschahriften", *ZDMG*, 1883, 1887.

Fergusson, J., *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, 2nd Edition, Revised and Edited by J. Burgess and R.P. Spiers, London, 1910.

———*Tree and Serpent Worship*, 2nd Edition, London, 1973.

Geldner, K.F., *Vedische Studien*, Stuttgart, 1889-1901.

Griffiths, J., *The Paintings in the Buddhist Cave Temples of Ajanta*, London, 1896-1897.

Havell, E.B., *Aryan Rule in India*.

Hillebrandt, A., *Vedische Mythologie*, Bresleu, 1891-1892.

Hultzsch, E. (Edited), *Corpus Inscriptionum*, Vol. I (*Inscriptions of Aśoka*), London, 1888-1925.

Keith, A.B., *India Logic and Atomism*, Oxford, 1931.

Konow, Sten, *Karpūramañjari.*

Macdonell, A.A., *Vedic Mythology*, Strassburg, 1897.

Muir, J., *Sanskrit Translation of the Ṛgveda.*

Pargiter, F.E., *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, London, 1912.

Pischel, *Vedische Studeien* (in Collaboration with Geldner), London, 1889-1901.

Schrader, F. Otto, *Reallexicon der Indogermanischen Altertumskunde.* Strassburg, 1901.

———*Spachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, Jena, 1890 (English Translation by F.B. Jevons under the title *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples*, London, 1906).

———*Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Adyar Library* (*Upanisads*), Madras, 1908.

Sru-Ma-chien, *History of Chang-Kien's Career and Embassies.*

Watt, George, *Commercial Products of India*, London, 1908 (Being the abridged edition of the *Economic Products of India*, in 12 vols.).

Weber, A., *Indische Studien*, Vols. I and II, Berlin.

Journals

Journal of American Oriental Society.

Journal of Royal Asiatic Society.

Journal of Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society.

Index

A

Abhimanyu, 142, 157, 159
Acchodā, 117, 119
Adhiratha, 210
Adhīvāsa, A long loose-flowing dressing-gown, suiting both men and women, 66
Adṛśyantyē, 197
Afghanistan, 60
Agastya, 70, 149
Agni, 118
Agniśālā, 30
Agnivarṇa, 210
Aila, A6, 60 ff.
Ajamīḍha, 181, 190, 207, 208
Ajātapayodharā, 'fit for or used to a wandering life', 91.
Ajina, 57
Akrūra, 196, 197, 217, 218
Akṣayāśva, 123
Akṣu, 29
Alaja, 37
Alarka, 204
Amāvasu-Aila, 119
Ambarīṣa, 123, 124, 147
Ambā, 192
Ambālikā, 169, 170, 186, 192, 216
Ambikā, 174, 186, 192, 216
Aṃśumat, 125
Anaraṇya, 123, 124
Andhaka Mahābhoja, 222
Anga, 116, 117, 163, 207
Angirasa, 36 ff.
Anirudha, 221
Antaḥpurādhyakṣa, Harem-Superintendent (Chamberlain) 26
Antevāsin, Resident student, 13
Anucarī, Slave girl, 86, 89
Aṇuha, 210
Anukṣatṛ, distributor of the king's gifts etc., 26
Apālā, 107
Apratiratha, 122
Arjuna, 139, 140, 141, 142, 151, 158, 159, 161, 180,

181, 190, 195, 202, 214, 217.
Asanga, 217
Asita-Devala, 192
Aśmamavī, 19
Aṣṭaka 155, 159, 204
Aṣṭāvakra, 175, 223, 224, 225
Asura, 186
Aśvamedha, 135
Aśvapati, 172, 183
Aśvattha, 6
Aśvin, 80, 171
Atk, A tailor-made close-fitting jacket, bodice or cloak (also see Drapi and Praliḍhi), 66, 67
Auśija, 102
Auśinārī, 164, 189
Avaḥsthūṇa, copper, bronze or iron pillars, 34
Avanti, 153
Avata, a village well, 28
Avidhavā, wife with husband, 104
Avikṣita, 205, 206
Ayas, copper or steel-plating and sundry-metal, 35
Ayodhyā, 125, 155
Ābhīra, 196, 219
Ācārya, 12
Ācārya-Kula-Vāsin, resident, 13
Āhuka, 222
Āhukē, 153
Ārokāḥ, Brilliants, flowers, stars or other spotty patterns embroidered all over the cloth (corresponding to modern 'Phul', 'buta', etc.), 63
Ārya-Śūdrā, 88, 102
Āsāda, seat proper (i.e. the cushion for sitting on), 54
Āsandī, a comfortable chair of wooden framework with adjuncts of diverse other materials, 49, 51, 52 53, 54, 55, 56
Āsandīvant, Possessing the throne, 27, 53
Āṭikī, wife, fit for or used to a wandering life, 91
Āvastha, rest-house, 15
Āṣtaraṇa, coverlet, 54, 55
Ātreya, 161 ff.
Āvika, sheep's wool, 58
Āyasī, 19
Āyatana, Enclosure, 'abode' or 'home' 3, 4, 5

B

Babhru-Yādava, 216
Balanandharā, 214
Barāsī, Barken Stuff, 61
Barhi, 'seat of the goods', a litter of 'balbaja' grass strewn on the sacrificial ground, 47, 65
Bhadrā-Kākṣīvatī, 176, 179, 186
Bhadrā-Vaiśālī, 196, 216, 218
Bhadraśreṇya, 125
Bhajamāna, 129, 209
Bhalananda, 187

Bharadvāja 147, 148, 177, 178, 182
Bharata 7, 53, 55, 120, 147, 148, 151, 178, 189, 197, 202, 205, 206, 207
Bhṛgu 118, 119, 131, 167,180, 204.
Bhrūṇa, Unknown sex, 105, Bhrūṇa-hatyā, female infanticide
Bloomfield 7
Brahmadatta 209, 210
Brhmā 136
Bṛhaspati 38
Bṛsi cushion-seat' of grass 47 (Vṛsi, Vrsi)
Buddha 131, 162
Bāhu 193, 203
Bāṇa 221
Bhānu 157
Bhānumatī 157, 214
Bhārata War (Mahābhārata *Circa* 1050-850 B.C.,) 113, 116, 134, 137, 156, 184, 190, 191, 196, 210
Bhārgava 70, 71, 118, 127, 193, 201, 204
Bhīma 158, 214, 215
Bhīṣma 141, 167, 168, 169, 170, 175, 184, 191, 192
Bhūmanyu 176

C

Chitraratha 217
Camū a vault or dome of solid stone or bricks, structure enclosed by an indefinite number of enclosing stones 39, 42
Candrāvati 221
Caṇḍakauśika 181
Cedi 214, 216
Chumuri 18
Citrāngadā 180, 195, 214
Coḍa, Conical bricks 36
Cyavana 118 Cyavana-Bhārgava 182
Cyavāna 85, 98, 102

D

Dakṣa 148, 201
Dakṣa Prajāpati,146
Damana 181
Damayantī 181, 188, 189, 190
Danu 117
Darbha, 47
Daśaratha 125, 181, 197, 207, 219
Daśārṇa 211
Dasyu 186
Datta 202
Dehī 20
Devaka 218, 222
Devakī 196, 218
Devamīdhūṣa 217
Devī 120
Devṛ 78 (Devṛ-Kāma) 79, 80, 83, 84
Devayānī 120, 200
Dharma 171, 172, 173, 175
Dharmadhvaja 223
Dharmaśālā 15
Dhṛṣṭadyumna 127, 128, 151, 181
Dhṛtarāṣṭra 183, 216, 219
Dhūmravarṇa 200
Dhruva 122

Dhundu 201
Dhuni 18
Didhiṣu 83, 84, 95 79 (Didhiṣu-Pati)
Dilīpa 125
Diṃbhaka 222
Diti 117
Divodāsa 155, Divodāsa-Bhaimarathi 204
Drāpi, a tailor-made close-fitting jacket bodice or cloak 66, 67, (also see Atka and Praliḍhi)
Draupadī 127, 128, 139, 146, 152, 157, 158, 159, 160, 181, 184, 185, 194 (Draupadī-Sairandhrī) 214, 215
Droṇa 37, 42
Dṛṣadvati 204
Druhyu 163
Drupada 34, 45, 127, 128, 151, 211, 214
Duḥśāsana 159
Durdama 203
Dur, door 32
Durga 23
Durjaya 138, 202
Duroṇa 33
Durvāsas 176, 220
Durya, doorpost 33 (also see 'Duryoṇa 'Duroṇa' which means house)
Duryodhana 141, 222
Duryoṇa doorpost house 33
Duṣyanta-Aila 121
Duṣyanta 176, 201, 205, 206
Dvārāvatī 141, 158, 190, 156, 217, 219
Dvimīḍha 211
Dvivida 153
Dalbhya-Caikitāneya 224, 225
Dāsa 18, 19, 20, 86, 89, 102, 115
Dāsī 86, 102
Dhūminī 107
Dīrghatamas 85, 148, 165, 167, 179, 182, 183, 189

E

Ekalavya 158, 184

G

Gadi 53
Ganges 194, 195
Gāñt, knot 65
Gaurī 120
Gautama 154, 163, 183, 189, 205 (Gautama-Bhāradvāja)
Gautamī 145
Gaya, household1
Gālva 157
Gāndhārī 183, 209
Geldner 6, 16, 17
Girivraja 165, 183
Gobhila 184
Gogṛha, fortified, extensive cowstalls the scenes of many knightly ventures 21
Gomanta 218
Gopura, 21 ('Gomati pur' cowstall made of earthen ramparts with timber palisade and ditch).
Goṣṭhī clan—gatherings at the 'Goṣṭha' ('grazing ground' p. 7, 'standing place for

cows'; cowstall and cattle-shed attached to the clan-abodes) whose functions were pre-eminently social and pleasurable 7, 11, 15

Gotra arrangements for accommodation of cattle family or clan 6, 7, 8, 9.

Grāma 27.

Grāmaṇī 17, 27.

Gṛhapati 64.

Gṛhān a special type of 'Śmaśāna', the funeral structure (mausoleum) with many rooms erected over or beside the grave in memory of the deceased 42, 43, 44.

H

Haihaya 70, 120, 133, 157, 163, 179, 180, 193, 195, 196, 202, 203, 204, 206, 210, 217.

Haimavati-Dṛṣādvati 122, 123, 146.

Haṃsa 222.

Hanumat 185.

Hariṇa 57.

Hariścandra-Aikṣvāka, 131, 137, 139, 203.

Harita 124, 220.

Harmya, home family settlement, a nobleman's abode 3, 24, 25, 44, 52.

Haryaṅga 181.

Haryaśva 155, 219.

Hastināpura 27, 169.

Havirdhāna 31.

Hillebrandt 9.

Hiraṇyadhanu 158.

Hiraṇyakaśipu 48, 137, 183.

I

Ibhya 18, 27

Iḍā 38.

Ikṣvāku 199

Ilinā 122

Indra 71, 72, 140, 154, 156, 157, 171, 224, 190 (Indra-Vijaya).

Indraprastha 196, 224, 216, 222

Indrasena 193

Indrasenā 209

Indrāṇī 69.

Indus 59, 60

Iravat 180.

Iṣṭaka 35 (the first explicit mention of the use of burnt bricks 'pakva' for structural purposes occurs rather late in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 7th-6th century B.C.) 38, 36 ('Svaynrā-tṛṇṇā' or 'naturally perforated' bricks and bricks of all colours); maṇḍaleṣṭaka (circular bricks); 'vikarṇī' (earless or corner-less bevelled bricks); 'Coḍa' (crest conical bricks); 'Vamabhṛt' (the gold-headed bricks); 'kumbheṣṭaka (the shaped pot-bricks).

Iṭa, fine clay or unbacked bricks, 30.

J

Jamadagni - Bhārgava 193.
Jambavatī 219.
Janadeva 223.
Janadeva 126, 223.
Janamejaya-Pārikṣita 27, 53, 135 (Janamejaya-Pārikṣita II, *Cir*. 900 B.C.), Janamejay III, 160,222
Janī 104
Jantu 130, 208
Jarāsandha, 181, 183, 214, 216 222
Jāra 85,
Jāriṇī 92
Jaṭila-Gautamī 146, 147, 159
Jayadratha 160
Jāyā 103, 104
Jayāmgha 184, 203
Jñāti, brother and sister 77

K

Kaca-Devayānī 119
Kahoda 175
Kaiśika 153
Kakṣīvant 179
Kalmāṣapāda 166, 193
Kalapagrāma 196
Kamadya 98
Kambala 59
Kaṃsa 184, 197, 216, 222
Kanā 103
Kaṅka 37
Kaṇṭakī 48
Kaparda, dress of the Vāśiṣṭhas, white clothes and their 'Kaparda' worn on the right side of the head so that they could never have used turbans, 70, 71 72
Kapila-Vastu 134
Karaṇ 207
Karandhama 193, 197, 206
Karavīrapura in the lower Deccan 218
Kareṇumatī 214
Karṇa 158, 159, 184, 197, 210
Kaśipu 48
Kaurava 169
Kauśalyā 125, 189, 207
Kauśāmbī 23
Kavaṣa 102
Kavī 120
Kākṣīvant 85, 210
Kālyavana 220
Kāma 137, 139, 221
Kāmpīla 22,
Kānyakubja 119, 155, 195, 204
Kārta-Ugrāyudha 191
Kāruṣa 158, 184
Kāśa 48
Kāśi 162, 183, 185, 190, 204, 216, 223
Kāśyapa 117, 161, 174, 204 207
Kekaya 203, 216
Keśarin 185
Khala 28
Khanitra 192, 205
Khaṭvāṅga 125
Kīcaka 160, 194, 216

Kīkaṭa 41, 194
Kiṣkindhā 149,153
Kośala 125, 130, 135, 134, 163, 176, 183, 185, 188, 189, 192, 195, 207, 210
Kṛśāśva 123
Krātha 153
Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva 128, 129, 132, 138, 153, 157, 158, 162 184, 190, 196, 211, 217,218, 219, 220, 221, 224
Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana-Vyās 127, 151, 152, 168, 169, 170, 175, 183
Kṛtavarman 141, 190, 222, 223
Kṛtavīrya, 202, 203
Kṣatra-56
Kṣattṛ 26
Kṣatriya 82, 134, 135, 167, 173
Kṣauma 60
Kujṛmbha 187
Kukura 222
Kula 12 ff
Kulapā, house-protector or family chief p.2 92
Kuṁba 71, 72, 73
Kumbhestaka 36 (See Iṣṭaka)
Kuṇḍina 188
Kunti 141, 152, 157, 158, 160, 167, 170, 172, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 184, 192, 193, 194, 214
Kuntibhoja 141, 172, 175
Kūrca 47
Kurīra 72
Kuru 39, 161, 169, 170, 173, 179, 185, 185, 192, 211, 225
Kurukṣetra 163, 184
Kuśa 58
Kuśika 133,182
Lakṣmana 151, 189
Loga 44
Lomapāda 149
Lopāmudrā 149
Ludwig 8, 16

M

Madayantī 166, 174, 193, 208
Madhu 219
Madhyadeśa (Kuru-Pañcāla and Kāśi-Kośala) 50, 133, 186
Madir 196
Madirā 218
Madra 172, 183, 213, 222
Magadha 41, 42, 46, 153, 214, 216
Mahāgrāma, big village or township27
Mahāpatha, highway 14
Mahāśāla 5
Mahāvrata 94
Mahiṣī 26, 87
Mahīdhara 16
Mainda 153
Mamatā 147, 148
Maṇḍaleṣṭaka 36 (See Iṣṭaka)
Mandodarī 141, 186, 189
Maniparvata, 220
Maṇipura (Kaliṅga ?) 214
Manu 79, 85, 121, 136, 137, 139, 146, 166, 177, 199
Marut 57, 58. 80, 171,

Maruta 146, 176, Marutta 205, 206
Marya 96, 103, Maryasri, 96
Mataṅga 185
Mathurā 217
Matināra 121
Matsya 194, 215, 216
Mauñji 58
Mayūkha 62
Mādhavī-Dṛṣadvati 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 204
Mādrī 170, 172, 176, 177, 193, 194, 214, 209
Mālinī 223
Māna, 3
Mānasāra 24
Māndhātṛ 122, 124,200
Mārīṣā 145, 146
Mārttikāvata 192, 222
Māṭha, meadow 7
Medhātithi-kāṇva 122
Megasthenes 24
Menā 103
Methi 34
Mitrasaha 222
Muñja 55
Mṛtyu Kanyā 177
Mayavatī 191, 221
Mudāvatī 187
Mudgala 209

N

Naḍvalā 48
Nagara 23, 24; Nagarin 22, 23
Nahuṣa-Aila 119, 190
Nakula 159, 214
Nala 138, 188
Nanda 220
Naraka-Bhauma 190, 219, 220
Nariṣyanta 193
Narmadā 117, 123, 125, 147, 177
Nābhāga-nediṣṭa 136, 220
Nāga 180, 186, 195, 214, 218
Nārada 181
Nārminī 18
Nātha 18, 27
Nikumbha 157
Nimi 222
Nīpa 208, 210
Nirvindhyā 187
Niṣāda 258, 185, 195
Niveśana, Fresh colonial settlement, resting place, stall for cattle 2
Niyoga 78, 79, 83, 163
Nīvi, 63, 64
Nṛtu 67
Nyocanī, a companion slave-girl given away with the bride, a very ancient custom ascribed to some of the earliest royal marriages in Epic-Puranic tradition 89

O

Opaśa, a crown-shaped coiffure 71, 72

P

Padmāvati 222
Paḍvīśa, leggings of a horse, 69, 'Vaṭuriṇā padā' (heavy covering footguards used by chiefs in battle) patsanginī' (somewhat clumsy

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

hampering foot-fasteners used by soldiers)
Pakṣas, side-rooms 30
Pakva 35 (see Istaka)
Palada 29
Pālāgalī 87
Pañcajana 125
Pañcāl 151, 225
Pañcapapa 161
Pañcaśikhā 223
Pañcendra 160
Parāśara 157, 184, 191
Parigha 34, 35
Parikṣita 195, Parikṣita II 222 (See Janamejaya)
Parimit 28
Parisathyā 14
Pariṣad associations of learned men councils of judges and ministers, sittings around the acāryas 11, 12, 13
Pariveṣṭrī 89
Parivrata 136
Parivṛkti 26, 87, 88, 89
Paruṣṇī 58, 59, 60
Paryanka, a magnified 'āsandī' associated with regal style and opulence; 'Paryankikā' a smaller seat 54, 56
Paryāṇahana 66
Pastyā, house family; 'aśvapastyā' stall for horses 3, 6
Pat-sangiṇī 69, (See Paḍvīśa)
Pathikṛt, the Path-makers 13
Paṭharu 18
Pati-justā 104
Patnī-sāmana 109
Paurava 123, 141, 179, 182, 190, 197, 216, 219
Paurukutsī 182
Pāṇḍava 139, 140, 145, 173, 216, 220, 222
Pāṇḍu, 146, 158, 160, 167, 168, 170, 173, 175, 176, 177, 184, 192, 193, 294, 214
Pāṣya 20
Pāvārika 152
Peśa, 67, Peśamsi
Pīḍi, Piḍhā49
Pischel 16
Pipru, 18
Pīṭha 46; Pīṭhasarpin
Pīvarī 127
Prabhāsa 222
Prabhāvatī 221
Pradveśī 148
Pradyumna 137, 139, 191,221
Praghāta 63
Prajāpati, 75, 136
Prasenajit, 122, 223
Prastara 47
Pratardana, 155
Pratidhi 66
Prapatha, 14, 15; Prapathi
Pratimit, 28
Pratipa, 184, 211
Pratiṣṭhāna 155
Prācī 41, 68
Prācīsaśāla 5
Prācya 41 46
Prāgjyotiṣa 190, 219
Prākāra, 22
Prāsāda, 22
Pṛṣati (Pārṣatī) 128, 185
Pṛthu 136; Pṛthu-Vainya 145

Pṛthvī 19
Proṣṭha 52
Pulasti 70; Pulastya
Pulomā 118
Punarbhadra-Vaibhāṇḍaki 181
Punjab 60, 183
Pur 18, 19, 21, 22
Pura (Tripura Mahapura three row of fortifications) great fortified cities,city with three concentric walls 22, 23, 24
Puramiḍhi city 22
Purapati 27
Puraya city 22
Purīṣa 36
Puru, 201
Puruhūta 171, 172, 175
Purujit 141, 172, 175; Purujit-Kuntibhoja 222
Purukutsa 123, 124, 147, 177,
Purukutsānī Narmadā 186, 200
Purumitra 98
Puṣan 58, 71 75, 137, 139
Putradaśana 194

R

Raivataka, 217, 222
Rathavitī Dālbhya 97
Ratna-dvīpa 220
Ratna-havis 26, 27
Rākṣas 91, 149, 186, 214
Rājanya 84
Rājasūya 17, 26, 215
Rāma 126, 130, 132, 150, 150, Rāma Daśarathi 189, 218
Raudrāśva 199, 201
Rāvaṇa 149
Reika-Bhārgava, 181
Reṇukā-Prāsenajit 193
Revata, 139
Revatī 218
Ṛkṣa 149, 185
Ṛṣyaṣṛnga 181, 182
Ṛtuparṇa 188, 189
Radasī 80
Rohiṇī-Pauravī 196, 218
Romaśā, 210
Roth 6, 7, 8, 16
Rudra 71
Rukma-Prastaraṇa 51
Rukmavatī 221
Rukmiṇī 196, 216, Rukmiṇī-Vaidarbhī 219
Rumā, 149

S

Śaivyā 203, 214
Śaka, 195, 196, 205
Śaktṛ 197
Śakuntalā, 206
Śambara 18, 191, 221
Śamyu 120
Śanku 34, 45
Śantanu 169, 184, 191, 192, 197, 211
Śarma house 2
Śaryāti-Mānava, 118
Śaśavindu 201, 202
Śatabhuji 19
Śatadhanvan-Hārdikya (Yādava), 182
Śatānīka, 223
Śatarūpā 136, 137
Śākya 132, 134
Śālā 4, 5, 6, 7
Śālāpati 4

CC-0. Agamnigam Digital Preservation Foundation, Chandigarh

Śāmba 139, 221
Śāmulya 59, 67
Śānī 58
Śāradaṇḍāyanī 167, 174, 175, 181
Śāradī 20
Śikhaṇḍāyanī 211
Śilpa-Śāstra 25
Śini 217
Śīrṣaṇya56
Śiśupāla 116
Śiva 149, 157
Śivi 155, 156, 159, 204
Śmaśāna 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45
Śraddhā 118, 137
Śrāddhadeva 118
Śrutadeva 158, 184
Śūdra 86, 189, 222
Śūdrā, 89, 102
Śuka 127
Śukra-Uśanas 119, 120, 127, 201
Śunaḥśepa 75
Śūparnakhā 149
Śvetaketu 85, 160, 175, 225
Śyāla 97
Śyāvāśva 97, 98, 102
Sabhā 9, 10, 15, 11, 27, 96
Sadas 48
Sagara 125, 133, 181, 182, 195, 196, 202, 203
Sahadeva 157, 159, 208, 214
Sahamarana 197
Samana 94, 95, 96
Saṃhatāśva 122, 123
Samiti 9
Sarmiṣṭhā 201
Sarasvatī, 122, 217.
Satasṛṅga 173
Satvant 130
Satvata 129
Sātvata 130
Sāttvata 209
Sātvatī 130
Satyabhāmā-Satrājit 139
Satyartha-Tṛśanku 188, 203
Satya-Satrājit 196
Satyavatī 157, 167, 168, 170 172, 176, 182, 184, 191 192 211
Satya-Nāgnajitī 219
Satyā-Sātrājitī 218
Saudāsa 166 175
Sātyakī 141, 190, Sātyakī-Yuyudhana 217
Sāyaṇa 7, 16
Setu 14
Sic (Pār Añclā), 62, 63
Simhikā 117, 118.
Sindhu 59
Sinīvālī 71,72
Sītā 126, 132, 150, Sita-Vaidehi 189
Sakambha 33, 34
Skanda 138
Sobhari-Kāṇva 86, 199
Soma 66, 72, 92, 146, 159
Somaka 208, 209, 211
Śonitapura 221
Sṛnjaya 129, 181
Sṛnjayī 129
Stambha 33
Sthānu 33
Sthūṇā 29
Sthūṇā 33, 35
Stūkā 71
Stūpa 40, 42

Subhadrā 159, 214, 215
Subhāngī 221
Sudāsa 179, 208
Sudeṣṇā 164, 216
Sugrīva 139, 153, 185
Sublabhā 223
Sumitrā 207, 219
Sunandā 148; Sunandā-Sārvasenī 176
Suda 150
Sunīthā 116, 117
Surodha 122
Suśīlā-Madrī 219
Sūta 25
Svanaya-Bhavayavaya 102, 210
Svaru 33.
Svaymātrṇṇā 36 (See Iṣṭaka).
Svayambhuva-Manu 137
Śvetakarṇa 223
Syeṇa 37

T

Taittiri 137, 139
Talp 49, 50 (Guru Talpa), 51
Taṃsu 122
Tantra 51
Tantu 61
Tālajangha 202
Tānva 107
Tārā 149, 151, 186, 189
Tārpya60 62
Taxila 134
Tilottamā 150
Tīrtha 15
Trasadasyu 123, 124
Trayyāruṇa 188
Trigarta 194
Triśanku 203, 208
Tṛṇa 29
Turvasa 163
Tūṣa 63, 65
Tvaṣṭar 49

U

Ucchīrṣaka 56
Uddālaka 160, 167, 168, 175
Udayabhadra 132
Ugrasena 184, 197, 221, 223
Ugrāyudha (Dvimidha-Pāñcāla) 183, 211
Ulūpī 180, 186, 194, 214
Umā 149
Upadhāna 45
Upamit 28
Upasunda 150
Upaśraya 54
Upayaja 182
Upavarhaṇa 54, 56
Upavāsana 54, 66
Upānaha 69
Upānasa 28
Ūrdara 28
Ūrdara 28
Ūrjayantī 18
Ūrṇā 58, 62
Urvaśī 139, 140, 190, 214, 222
Urvī 19
Uṣā 221
Uśīj 189
Uśīnara 133, 155, 159, 183, 204, 205
Uṣṇīṣa 66, 68, 69, 70
Utallya 147, 148
Utaṅka 160, 168
Uttānapada 136
Uttara Kuru 25

Uttarā Vairāṭī 139, 142, 214, 216
Uttarīya 66

'V'

Vadhu 86
Vahya 50, 51, 52‘ 53
Vairaja 25
Vaiśālī 134, 187, 192, 193, 195, 205
Vaiśya 16, 17, 27, 84, 219, 220, 222
Vajra 190, 221
Vajranābha 221
Vaka 162
Vall 66, 167, 175, 183, 189, 205, 207
Vaṃśa 29
Vapra 21
Vapuṣmat 193
Vapuṣṭamā 223
Vartra 28
Varuṇa 24, 42, 93, 120
Vaśiṣṭha 166, 167, 174, 275, 188, 203, 207, 208
Vasu 209, 216
Vasudeva 196, 218, 219,
Vasumanas 155
Vatsa 132, 137
Vatsaprī 187
Vaṭurīṇā padā,69 (See Paḍvīśa
Vivitrī 61
Vahlīka 169, 170, 175, 196, 218
Vāhya (ka), 129
Vālī 149 153, 185
Vāmadeva 207
Vambhṛt 36 (See Iṣṭaka)
Vānara 186.
Vārāṇasī, 155
Vāsa (Dhūti), 60, 62, 64
Vāso-Vāya 58, 61
Vātapāna,63.
Vāstu dwelling house 3, 37, 42
Vāvātā, 26, 87, 88.
Vāya, 61
Vema, 61
Veṅa, 116
Vibhiṣaṇa 149
Vicitravīrya 141, 167, 170, 173, 174, 175, 176, 184, 192, 197, 214
Vidarbha, 141, 153, 184, 188, 189, 203, 221, 222
Vidatha 4, 8, 9, 15, 178
Videha 39, 134, 223
Vidhavā 83
Vidura 161 170, 173, 175, 222. (Vidura-Kaurava)
Viduratha 187
Vijayā 214
Vijāmātṛ 97
Vikarṇī 36 (See Iṣṭaka)
Vikuṣi 99
Vimada 97, 98, 102
Vipatha 41
Vipacitti, 117, 118
Virajā 119, 149
Virāṭa 172, 175, 216
Viś 3
Viśoka 215
Viśpati 4; Vispatni 4
Viśvabhuj 157
Viśva-Mahat 125
Viśva-Saha 125
Viśvāmitra 155, 159, 181, 182, 183, 188, 204
Viṣṇu 170

Viṣṇuvṛddha 188, 203
Viṣṇvant 29, 72
Vitihotra 202
Vivasant 137
Vivasvant 118
Vīrā 193
Vrātya 46, 49, 53, 54, 57, 64, 68, 70
Vṛddhaśarman 125, 158
Vṛhadasva 199
Vṛhadvala 197, 210
Vṛhadratha 216
Vṛhanmanas 210
Vṛhaspati 147
Vṛṣṇi 128, 137, 209, 210 214. 215, 217
Virajā 119, 149
Virāṭa 172, 175, 216
Viś 3
Viśpati 4; Vispatni 4
Viśvabhuj 157
Viśva-Mahat 125
Viśva-Saha 125
Viśvāmitra 155, 159, 181, 182, 183, 188, 204
Viṣṇu 170
Viṣṇuvṛddha 188, 203
Viṣūvant 29, 72
Vitihotra 202
Vivasant 137
Vivasvant 111
Vīrā 183
Vrātya 46, 49, 53, 54, 57, 64, 68, 70
Vṛddhaśarman 125, 158
Vṛhadasva 199
Vṛhadvala 197, 210
Vṛhadratha 216
Vrhanmanas 210
Vṛhaspati 147
Vṛṣṇi 128, 137, 209, 210, 214, 215, 217
Vṛṣaparvan, 201
Vyāsa 131, 156, 194
Vyusitāśva 174, 176, 214

'W'

Weber 85
Whitney 7
Widow-burning 80
Yādava 15, 119, 121, 123, 129 130, 241, 153, 160, 160, 181 186, 188, 190, 181, 195, 197, 202, 202, 203, 204, 206, 209, 214, 216, 217, 218 219, 220, 222, 223, 224,
Yadu 202
Yaja 182
Yama 44, 66, 76, 92, 120, 144
Yama-Yamī 74, 75, 118
Yamī 46, 144
Yamunā 214
Yaśodā 125
Yauvanāśvī-Māndhātṛ 199
Yayāti 118, 127, 133, 144, 155 201, 202
Yoṣā (Yoṣaṇā Yoṣit) 103
Yoṣā 103
Yudhiṣṭhira 141, 151, 173, 176 214, 215
Yūpa 33
Yuvanāśva 123, 124
Yuvati 103

'Z'

Zimmer 8, 16, 19, 85

CORRIGENDA.

’age	1,	line	2	of	text,	*for*	Rgveda	*read*	Ṛgveda
,,	6	,,	1	,,	n. 11	,,	II	,,	11
,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,, ,,	,,	Saṅkh.	,,	Sāṅkh.
,,	7	,,	15	,,	text	,,	‘goṭṣha’	,,	‘goṣṭha’
,,	,,	,,	19	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,
,,	10	,,	6	,,	n. 1	,,	music-and	,,	music- and
,,	11	,,	1	,,	,, 5	,,	Bṛhad. Upan.	,,	Bṛhad. Upan.,
,,	,,	,,	2	,,	,, ,,	,,	VI.,	,,	V. I.,
,,	14	,,	3	,,	,, 2	,,	Upon.	,,	Upan.
,,	15	,,	1	,,	,, 5	,,	Śāṅkh.	,,	Śāṅkh.
,,	16	,,	2	,,	,, 10	,,	Javadr‿cha	,,	Jayadratha
,,	17	,,	1	,,	,, 1	,,	Sam.	,,	Saṃ.
,,	,,	,,	2	,,	,, ,,	,,	,,	,,	,,
,,	19	,,	2	,,	,, 8	,,	T. 22	,,	T. 2^2
,,	26	,,	1	,,	,, 6	,,	Sam.	,,	Saṃ̊.
,,	29	,,	7	,,	,, 8	,,	Ajantā	,,	Ajaṇṭā
,,	30	,,	2	,,	,, 1	,,	‘iṭāwā’	,,	‘iṭawā’
,,	,,	,,	15	,,	,, ,,	,,	‘istakā’	,,	‘iṣṭakā’
,,	,,	,,	20	,,	,, ,,	,,	‘it(ḍ)a’	,,	‘iṭ(ḍ)a’
,,	,,	,,	21	,,	,, ,,	,,	‘ita-ppu’	,,	‘iṭa-ppu’
,,	,,	,,	22	,,	,, ,,	,,	‘Iḍāvā’	,,	‘Iḍavā’
,,	,,	,,	36	,,	,, ,,	,,	ilā	,,	iḷā
,,	32	,,	1	,,	,, 3	,,	Sam.	,,	Saṃ.
,,	,,	,,	3	,,	,, ,,	,,	,,	,,	,,
,,	,,	,,	17	,,	,, ,,	,,	,,	,,	,,
,,	33	,,	6	,,	,, 5	,,	‘rūpam sukṛtam’		‘rūpaṃ sukṛtaṃ’
,,	,,	,,	1	,,	,, 10	,,	sthūṇā	,,	‘sthūṇā’
,,	34	,,	1	,,	text	,,	‘methi’s^1	,,	‘methi’s^1,
,,	35	,,	3	,,	,,	,,	copper	,,	copper-
,,	36	,,	6	,,	,,	,,	‘svaymātṛṇṇā’	,,	‘svayamātṛṇṇā’
,,	,,	,,	1	,,	n. 3	,,	Sam.	,,	Saṃ.
,,	41	,,	3	,,	,, 4	,,	Kikaṭesu	,,	Kīkaṭeṣu
,,	,,	,,	12	,,	,, ,,	,,	Orissa)	,,	Oriṣṣa))
,,	42	,,	21	,,	text	,,	flames,’	,,	flames,’’
,,	,,	,,	1	,,	n. 1	,,	‘śagad’	,,	‘śaga*d*’
,,	,,	,,	3	,,	,, ,,	,,	cadinu		ca*d*inu
,,	,,	,,	4	,,	,, ,,	,,	‘śagad’	,,	‘śaga*d*’
,,	,,	,,	3	,,	,, 4	,,	‘stupas’	,,	‘stūpas
,,	,,	,,	5	,,	,, 9	,,	‘stūpa’	,,	‘stūpa’)
,,	43	,,	22	,,	,, 3	,,	buḍi	,,	buḍī
,,	44	,,	1	,,	,, 1	,,	kindred,	,,	kindred’
,,	45	,,	2	,,	,, 2	,,	‘varana’	,,	‘varaṇa’
,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,, ,,	,,	Sat.	,,	Śat.
,,	46	,,	12	,,	,, 1	,,	toddy) (‘tāḷī’- drawing)	,,	toddy- (‘tāḷī’-) drawing)
,,	48	,,	4	,,	,, 2	,,	fibre—or	,,	fibre- or
,,	49	,,	1	,,	,, 6	,,	Kauś—	,,	Kauś.
,,	52	,,	6	,,	,, 3	,,	‘involving	,,	involving
,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,, ,,	,,	tuda’	,,	‘tuda’
,,	53	,,	1	,,	,, 8	,,	‘upastaraṇa’	,,	‘upāstaraṇa’
,,	55	,,	4	,,	text	,,	‘āsandī’s’	,,	‘āsandī’s
,,	58		14	,,	,,	,,	‘uṛṇā’	,,	‘ūrṇā’

Page	58,	line	2	of	n.	6	*for*	'u*r*uṇi'	*read*	'u*r*uṇī'
,,	59	,,	17	,,	text		,,	('śundhyavaḥ).[11]'		('ṣundhyavaḥ').[11]
,,	,,	,,	6	,,	n.	6	,,	'semmaṛī'	,	'semma*r*ī'
,,	,,	,,	8	,,	,,	,,	,,	'simbuḷi'	,,	'simbu*l*i'
,,	,,	,,	3	,,	,,	7	,,	'kamb(p)aḷi'	,,	'kamb(p)a*l*i'
,,	,,	,,	4	,,	,,	,,	,,	'Kuṛumbādu''	,,	'ku*r*umbāḍu'
,,	60	,,	1	,,	,,	4	,,	Sam.	,,	Saṃ.
,,	61	,,	3	,,	,,	9	,,	'sili'	,,	'si*l*i'
,,	,,	,,	5	,,	,,	,,	,,	'sā*r*i'	,,	'sā*r*ī'
,,	62	,,	2	,,	,,	4	,,	Sam.	,,	Saṃ.
,,	64	,,	3	,,	,,	6	,,	'khaddar?'	,,	'khadda*r*' ?
,,	65	,,	2	,,	,,	2	,,	7	,,	6
,,	66	,,	6	,,	text		,,	'o*r*ṅā'	,,	'o*r*ṇā'
,,	,,	,,	2	,,	n.	3	,,	'uṛuṇī'	,,	'u*r*uṇī'
,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	'dhūtī'	,,	'dhūti'
,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	'pagṛī'	,,	'pāg*r*ī'
,,	68	,,	1	,,	,,	11	,,	'pāg*r*i	,,	'pāg*r*ī
,,	69	,,	1	,,	,,	5	,,	"Rāk.°"	,,	Rākṣasa
,,	70	,,	9	,,	,,	7	,,	Pelasgü	,,	Pelasgii
,,	71	,,	1	,,	,,	10	,,	VI	,,	V. I.
,,	72	,,	30	,,	text		,,	'opaśa.'2.	,,	'opaśa'.2.
,,	73	,,	5	,,	n.	2	,,	'Kadṃā'	,,	'Kadmā'
,,	76	,,	1	,,	,,	6	,,	VI	,,	V. I.
,,	77	,,	,,	,,	,,	1	,,	,,	,,	,,
,,	79	,,	,,	,,	,,	4	,,	Brhaspati	,,	Bṛhaspati
,,	80	,,	,,	,,	,,	11	,,	Brā. Sūt. and	,,	Brā. and Sūt.
,,	81	,,	6	,,	,,	7	,,	brāhmanic	,,	brāhmaṇic
,,	83	,,	1	,,	,,	5	,,	'vidavā'	,,	'vidhavā'
,,	87	,,	18	,,	text		,,	'parivṛkti'	,,	'parivṛktī'
,,	,,	,,	2	,,	n.	3	,,	janibhih	,,	janibhiḥ
,,	,,	,,	6	,,	,,	4	,,	Kāṛh.	,,	Kāṭh.
,,	,,	,,	8	,,	,,	8	,,	wife	,,	wife'
,,	94	,,	5	,,	,,	9	,,	Paūcamī	,,	Pañcamī
,,	98	,,	3	,,	,,	11	,,	naṛṭiṣū	,,	nartiṣū
,,	99	,,	6	,,	,,	2	,,	'muḍi'	,,	'muḍi')
,,	01	,,	1	,,	,,	7	,,	Āśval,	,,	Āśval.
,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	5	,,	11, 15,	,,	11. 15.
,,	04	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	'jani'	,,	'janī'
,,	06	,,	,,	,,	,,	2	,,	'putriṇa'	,,	'putriṇā'
,,	08	,,	2	,,	,,	1	,,	vāryena'	,,	vāryeṇa'
,,	13	,,	24	,,	text		,,	traditions	,,	traditions,
,,	17	,,	4	,,	,,		,,	mind-born	,,	'mind-born
,,	,,	,,	3	,,	n.	5	,,	196,	,,	196;
,,	,,	,,	14	,,	,,	11	,,	etc.),	,,	etc.);
,,	121	,,	11	,,	,,	10	,,	sutān.	,,	sutān.)
,,	,,	,,	14	,,	,,	,,	,,	sutām	,,	sutā*m*
,,	122	,,	9	,,	,,	5	,,	putras	,,	putraś
,,	124	,,	5	,,	,,	1	,,	câtmajaḥ	,,	câtmajaḥ)
,,	125	,,	19	,,	text		,,	Viśa-saha	,,	Viśva-saha
,,	126	,,	15	,,	n.	3	,,	'ayonijā'	,,	'ayonijā·
,,	129	,,	4	,,	,,	8	,,	Vāhyakaścô pa -vāhyakaḥ	,,	Vāhyakaśc Ôpa -vāhyakaḥ.
,,	,,	,,	12	,,	,,	,,	,,	(teṣāṃ	,,	"(teṣāṃ
,,	136	,,	4	,,	,,	4	,,	Nābhā(ga)— nediṣṭa	,,	Nābhā(ga)- nediṣṭa

Page 138,	line 14	of	n. 4	*for*	'svasutāyaṃ'	*read*	'svasutāyāṃ'
,, 141	,, 9	,,	text	,,	father—	,,	father,—
,, 148	,, 3	,,	n. 7	,,	'bhartri'	,,	'bhartrī'
,, 150	,, 24	,,	,, 2	,,	Brahmāṇḍa op. cit.	,,	Brahmāṇḍa, op. cit.,
,, 154	,, 1	,,	,, 10	,,	Uśinara	,,	Uśīnara
,, 156	,, 26	,,	,, 1	,,	"maharṣiṇi va	,,	"maharṣīṇ iva
,, 162	,, 1	,,	,, 4	,,	4 Cf.	,,	4 Cf.
,, 163,			*headline*,	,,	IV.	,,	IV. NIYOGA.
,, 164,	line 29 (last)	of	text, should		be line 1 of text,		page 165.
,, 171,	line 4	,,	n. 2	*for*	31 n.	*read*	31γ
,, ,,	,, ,,	,,	,, ,,	,,	5 u,	,,	5μ
,, 172	,, 4	,,	,, 4	,,	25. 0.	,,	25θ
,, 174	,, 6	,,	text	,,	Vaśiṣṭha	,,	Vāśiṣṭha
,, 181	,, 10	,,	,,	,,	Ṛeīka	,,	Ṛcīka
,, ,,	,, 21	,,	,,	,,	11;	,,	11;—
,, 183	,, 3	,,	n. 2	,,	there.'	,,	there.
,, 184	,, 2	,,	,, 7	,,	27B	,,	27β
,, 185	,, ,,	,,	,, 1	,,	Śrutakīrttī	,,	Śrutakīrtti
,, 186			*headline*,	,,	V.	,,	V. WIDOW-REMARRIAGE AND WIDOW-BURNING.
,, 187	,, 7	of	n. 1	,,	themselves (e.g.	,,	themselves; e.g.
,, 190	,, 4	,,	,, 5	,,	Gauda	,,	Gauḍa
,, 192	,, 24	,,	text	,,	'anapūrvā'	,,	'anyapūrvā'
,, 195	,, 1	,,	n. 1	,,	1 Mbh.	,,	1 Mbh.
,, 198			*headline*,	,,	VI.	,,	VI. POLYGAMY.
,, ,,	,, 8	of	n. 2	,,	'Tāmasa,	,,	'Tāmasa'
,, 199	,, 1	,,	,, 4	,,	7, 45-8, 51	,,	7, 45—8; 51
,, 201	,, ,,	,,	,, 7	,,	Jaynatī'	,,	Jayantī
,, 202	,, 6	,,	,, 2	,,	Harīv.	,,	Hariv.
,, 205	,, 5	,,	,, 3	,,	adj.	,,	adj..
,, 206	,, 10	,,	text	,,	'samrāt'	,,	'samrāṭ'
,, 208	,, 18	,,	n. 3	,,	'apsaras'—like	,,	'apsaras'-like
,, 209	,, 2	,,	,, 8	,,	16.9	,,	16, 9
,, 211	,, 1	,,	,, 3	,,	15	,,	5
,, 213	,, 22	,,	text	,,	traditions	,,	tradition
,, ,,	,, 2	,,	n. 2	,,	(beg).	,,	(beg.).
,, ,,	,, 1	,,	,, 4	,,	17B	,,	17β
,, 215	,, 23	,,	text,		should be line 22		of text,
,, ,,	,, 24	,,	,,	,,	,, ,, ,, 23		,, ,, ,
,, ,,	,, 22	,,	,,	,,	,, ,, ,, 24		,, ,, .
,, 216	,, 13	,,	,,	*for*	"māgadhi"	*read*	"māgadhī"
,, 217	,, 2	,,	n. 5	,,	Bhānunati	,,	Bhānumatī
,, 218	,, 5	,,	,, 6	,,	Lakṣmiṇa	,,	Lakṣmaṇā
,, ,,	,, 15	,,	,, ,,	,,	(beg).	,,	(beg.)
,, 220	,, 1	,,	,, 1	,,	Vabhūva Karaṇì —Sutā	,,	vabhūva karaṇī-sutā
,, ,,	,, ,,	,,	,, 2	,,	Kā Sūt.	,,	Kā. Sūt.
,, 221	,, 6	,,	text	,,	Kṛṣṇā's	,,	Kṛṣṇa's
,, 223	,, 1	,,	n. 9	,,	132, 10599-134, 10690	,,	132, 10599—134, 10690
,, 225	,, 8	,,	text	,,	Pāñcala	,,	Pāñcāla

URS. 17471/72
(24)

~~SGA~~